DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 280 HE 031 337

TITLE	Bargaining Peer Evaluation & Mentoring Programs in Higher Education. NEA Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS).
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, DC. Higher Education Research Center.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	188p.; Contents selected from the National Education Association's (NEA) Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS) CD-ROM which contains over 500 higher education contracts with search and retrieval software.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, DC. 20036; phone: 202-822-7162.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; *Contracts; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Legal Problems; *Mentors; *Peer Evaluation; Teacher Associations
IDENTIFIERS	*National Education Association

ABSTRACT

This volume provides excerpts of negotiated language from existing labor contracts at two- and four-year colleges that deal with peer evaluation and mentoring of faculty and support staff; also included is a legal analysis of a related resolution adopted by the National Education Association (NEA). The first section presents excerpts, specifically addressing peer review, from the contracts of 25 two-year colleges, plus an additional list of two-year institutions whose contracts refer to peer review but lack detailed procedural language. The following section provides the same information for 17 four-year colleges and universities. Section 3 identifies the primary patterns found in contract language concerning mentoring, including sample paragraphs from ten institutions. The final section offers a legal analysis of NEA's Resolution New D, which addresses peer assistance and review programs. It identifies two possible legal problems: first, that a consulting teacher could be determined to be a "supervisory" employee within controlling labor law and, second, the bargaining unit status of consulting teachers. Relevant litigation is cited. A copy of the NEA resolution is attached. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 280

Bargaining Peer Evaluation & Mentoring Programs in Higher Education

NEA Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NEA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Higher Education Research Center

nea

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

HE 031 337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The contract information in this book was obtained from the 1996-97 release of NEA's Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS). The CD-ROM has over 500 higher education contracts from two-year and four-year campuses with search and retrieval software that allows users to search the contracts on specific words or phrases. The CD-ROM is available for use by NEA's higher education affiliates.

The contracts are gathered each year from administrators and union leaders. The data base has contracts from bargaining units that are represented by NEA, AFT, and AAUP. The support staff contracts have units represented by a wide range of unions including AFSCME, SEIU, UAW, and the Teamsters.

The contract analysis was done by Kris Dougherty, past statewide president of the United Faculty of Florida. Kris has also been a chief negotiator for the Florida State University system contract. The NEA contracts with her to do analysis of bargaining language.

This volume has language bargained in the areas of peer evaluation and mentoring. The examples are negotiated language from contracts and they do not represent NEA policy.

If you have questions or want more information please call the higher education office at 202 822-7100 or e-mail: cmaitland@nea.org.

Christine Maitland, Ph.D.
NEA Higher Education Coordinator

Two-year

The Board retains exclusive right to discharge instructors during their probationary period, and such action as deemed appropriate by the Board shall not be subject to the grievance procedure providing the provisions contained within Article VI.G.6(a) and Article VI.A.8 are complied with.

The Faculty Council and Board recognize the importance and value of a faculty evaluation program whose purpose is the improvement of instruction by classroom instructors and the improvement of student related activities performed by non-classroom instructors. The evaluation of faculty will be in compliance with the terms of this agreement including the provisions of the following four components:

a. Administrative Evaluation
b. Peer Evaluation
c. Student Evaluation
d. Self-Appraisal

(c) Peer Review:

(2) Non-probationary Instructors:

Peer review will take place biannually for each instructor. There will be two peer reviewers--one selected by the instructor, and the other will be the department chairperson or his/her designee. Each department chairperson must submit a schedule of his/her planned peer reviews to his/her dean by October 1 of each academic year.

When possible, peer reviewers will visit two courses, or two representative student related activities for non-teaching instructors, as mutually agreed upon by the instructor and his/her department chairperson, for at least one full class period each or a total of two hours of observation for non-teaching instructors.

Pre- and post-review discussions will take place between the instructor and his/her reviewers to discuss the visitation procedures evaluation criteria and the instructor's goals for the period(s) under review.

All observations and recommendations which occur as the result of peer review are confidential--known only to the instructor, the reviewers, and the department chairperson unless the instructor chooses to disclose the results to others except

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as deemed appropriate by the department chair when reporting for the department during an instructor's probationary period.

The appropriate dean/supervisor will receive notification from the department chairperson of the date of review and the names of the peer reviewers for each department member.

Butte Community College, CA (CA055.TXT)

6.6.6 Optional Peer Evaluation for Tenured Faculty

A. Selection of peer evaluator.

1. A tenured peer evaluator (any faculty member who has completed a District and BCEA sponsored in-service training session specifically designed for pre-evaluation) will be selected by mutual agreement between the evaluee and other administrator as designated. In those cases where mutual agreement cannot be reached, the evaluee and appropriate administrator will each select three faculty" names. Each will then cross off one name from the list leaving four names. The remaining names will then be placed in an appropriate container. The evaluee will then draw from the container. The name drawn will be the peer evaluator. A faculty member if asked is obligated to participate in at least one peer evaluation every two years.

2. The area dean or other administrator as designated and peer evaluator will work as a team to perform the instructor evaluation.

3. The peer evaluator and area dean will follow the same procedures used for the formal evaluation outlined in 6.,6.2 A-G, 6.6.3 A and B, 6.6.4 A-E and 6.6.5 A, B and C.

4. After the classroom observation the area dean (or other designated administrator) and peer evaluator will separately write the evaluation report.

5. The area dean (or other designated administrator) and peer evaluator will meet to compare their reports and by mutual agreement merge the two reports into one final document.

6. If mutual agreement cannot be reached, a second observation of a different class will be performed.

7. If no agreement is readied after the second observation, the assistant superintendent will select another administrator and the instructor will select another peer and repeat the process.

8. If the new team fails to reach agreement the administrator

will write the formal report and the peer will write a minority report that shall be attached to the final report.

6.6.7 Peer Evaluation for Probationary Faculty

A. The evaluee is to be given copies of all documentation (including student evaluations) ten working days before it is sent to the assistant superintendent

B. The evaluation team shall consist of.

1. The appropriate area dean or other administrator as designated, appointed by the assistant superintendent.

2. The department chairperson/coordinator of (if the chairperson/coordinator can not serve on the team) a faculty designee selected by mutual agreement between the are dean ard the chairperson/coordinator. If mutual agreement cannot be reached, us method outlined in 6.6.6 A.1.

3. A tenured peer evaluators) (any tenured faculty member who has completed in-service training as specified in 6.6.7 B.S.) chosen by the evaluee. Eight hours of flex credit per semester may be given if requested by peer evaluator.

4. In the event that the evaluation team or the evaluee wishes to bring in a content expert, by mutual agreement between the area dean and the evaluee they may select an individual from inside or outside the institution.

5. Any peer evaluator (including the chairperson/coordinator) shall have completed a District and BCEA sponsored in-service training session specifically designed for peer evaluation The training for current tenured faculty will be done during the first year of this contract at the fall (and spring if needed) faculty institute. Thereafter newly tenured faculty (or current faculty who missed the initial training sessions above) must Attend a required workshop to be trained. Flex credit will be available. A faculty member if asked is obligated to participate on at least one evaluation team every eight years (for a non-tenured faculty member).

6.6.8 Responsibilities and Timeline of the Evaluation

A. The chairperson of the evaluation team shall be the area dean or other administrator as designated.

B. A preliminary meeting with the probationary faculty member and all members of the team shall be held by the end of the fifth week of instruction of the first semester of employment. At the initial meeting, called by the team chair, the following shall be covered.

1. Explanation of the evaluation process.

2. Establishment of the timeline for the completion of all components of the evaluation process.

C. The evaluation team will have the responsibility of administering the student evaluation. It will include:

1. Administering the student evaluation component to a minimum of two classes, one chosen by the team and the other (a different class) chosen by the evaluee. The evaluee will choose the day(s) the student evaluations) will be administered. Within the timelines of 6.6.8 B.2 above, the student evaluation will be administered to different classes those visited by the team.

D. If an evaluee feels his/her job is in jeopardy, s/he may have a BCEA representative at any meeting or classroom observation concerning evaluation The BCEA representative shall be an observer only and will not participate directly or indirectly in the evaluation process, nor will his/her presence be mentioned in any documentation or discussion.

6.6.9 All evaluation team members will serve until such time as the contract employee is granted tenure or is terminated.

A. If a replacement of the peer evaluator is required, the evaluee will select another peer.

B. If a replacement of the chairperson/coordinator or faculty designee is required, -another person will be selected by mutual agreement between the chairperson/coordinator and the dean

C. If the evaluee wishes the chairperson/coordinator or faculty designee or peer evaluator to be replaced because of personal or professional differences (not the specific content of the evaluation), s/he may appeal to the Tenure Committee (see 6.6.6).

6.6.10 The Formal Evaluation for non-tenured faculty shall follow the same procedures outlined in the BCEA contract for tenured faculty (pre-conference, observation, post-conference, written evaluation, and an instructor improvement plan if necessary). Exceptions are as follows:

A. There will be one evaluation per semester by the evaluation team, each with a minimum of one joint class visit by all team members. One class will be chosen by the team (fall), the other (a different class) will be chosen by the evaluee (spring). Each visitation date will be selected by mutual agreement among all concerned. Either the evaluee or the team may request further class visits. These must be different classes from student evaluation.

B. Each team member will submit his or her own written evaluation to the team chairperson. If consensus is possible, a single evaluation by the team chairperson will be written. Otherwise,

each team member will submit his or her own evaluation with one of the recommendations stated in 6.6.10 D. Each team member will review the final report(s) before it is sent to the Tenure Committee. (See H10.)

C. The evaluee is to be given copies of all documentation (including student evaluations) ten (10) working days before it is sent to the Tenure Committee. After the evaluee discusses the documentation with the evaluation team, the team may revise the documentation and the. evaluee may submit a written response to the Tenure Committee.

D. Prior to February I of each year, the team shall jointly or separately make a recommendation to the Tenure Committee submitting all documentation.

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, CA (CA071.TXT)

15E. Peer Review Committee Composition and Role

15E.1 Committee Composition:

The Peer Review Committee shall include at least two tenured faculty members selected by a procedure established by the division or area. The committee may include other tenured faculty, administrators or peers from outside the college. The evaluee may challenge the committee make-up by requesting a change of one member on the committee.

15E.2 Committee Responsibilities:

a.Examine and Discuss the Professional Review

The Professional Review shall be submitted to the committee, which shall meet with the evaluee to discuss the evaluee's Professional Review . The discussion is designed to assist the evaluee in the following ways: examining the objectives, techniques, and accomplishments in relation to the Faculty Standards, to recognize outstanding performance, to identify areas in which changes might prove beneficial to students' learning, to facilitate communication about program needs. The committee may request additional supporting materials from among those listed above.

15E.3 Peer Review Summary

Based on the discussion and the Professional Review, the committee will write a Peer Review Summary to be given to the evaluee and attached to the Professional Review. The evaluee may attach any comments to the Peer Review Summary that goes to the supervisor. The supporting materials will then be returned to the evaluee.

15F.Supervisor Review and Responsibilities

The Professional Review Report and Peer Review Summary are forwarded to the immediate supervisor. The supervisor shall do the following:

- Review the documents,
- Attach appropriate comments to the documents,
- Assist faculty in examining their objectives, techniques, and accomplishments, and recognize outstanding performance,
- Assist in providing resources in areas in which changes might prove beneficial to students' learning,
- Review program needs.

The Supervisor Review is given to the evaluee, who may attach a response. The documents are then forwarded to the appropriate Vice-President.

15H. Grievance

In the event the evaluee believes that the procedures herein have not been followed, the evaluee may file a grievance.

Chaffey Community College, CA (CA003.TXT)

ARTICLE XX
EVALUATION PROCEDURES
INCLUDING PEER REVIEW

The purpose of this article is to improve instruction, counseling and other educational services assigned by the District through the periodic evaluation of bargaining unit members. All evaluations are final and non-grievable.

20.3.3 The employee's actual evaluation shall be conducted by a committee of peers.

a) Teaching Staff: The instructor shall name one peer and the first-level manager shall name one other. A third peer shall be named by the preceding two peers. The team shall elect a chairperson.

The evaluation shall include at least one classroom observation by each team member.

20.4.1 Regular employees shall be evaluated once every three years. The evaluation shall be completed by February 1.

20.4.2 The employee's actual evaluation shall be conducted by a committee of peers.

a) Teaching Staff: The instructor shall name one peer and the first-level manager shall name one other. A third peer shall be named by the preceding two peers. The team shall elect a chairperson.

The evaluation shall include at least one classroom observation by each team member.

College of the Canyons, CA (CA053.TXT)

Article VII - Evaluation

The purpose of faculty evaluation is to improve instruction, counseling, and other educational services through the periodic evaluation of contract and regular faculty. A. Procedure for evaluation of Contract (probationary) Employees

1. Evaluation Team

a. Each probationary faculty member will be assigned an

Evaluation Committee consisting of three (3) members. (This committee is in lieu of the peer evaluation committee used for the evaluation of Contract Faculty members.)

b. The Evaluation Committee shall consist of a faculty member appointed by the Division Chair from within the probationary faculty's division, who will serve as the Chair of the Committee (preferably someone from the hiring committee); a faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate from outside the probationary faculty's division; and the Chief Instructional Officer, or their designee.

c. Section 87663D of the Education Code reads: "The Peer Review Process shall be on a departmental or divisional basis and shall address the forthcoming demographics of California, and the principles of Affirmative Action. The process shall require that the peers reviewing are both representative of the diversity of California and sensitive to affirmative action concerns, all without compromising quality and excellence in education."

d. The members of the committee, subject to the limitations listed below, will serve on the committee until the probationary faculty members has been granted tenure or has been terminated.

2. Timeline

a. Initial Conference The evaluation team will meet no later than

the third week of the semester. The purpose of the initial conference will be for the evaluatee to familiarize the other team members with the courses to be evaluated. The evaluatee will:

(1) Submit for evaluation two (2) of the courses that he/she is currently teaching.

(2) If he/she has not done so prior to the conference, present a copy of the course objectives to the other members of the team.

(3) Explain the nature of the course and discuss his/her teaching methods, examinations, assignments, etc. as they relate to the stated objectives.

(4) Identify other non-classroom related activities in which he/she is participating, or intends to participate; e.g., committee work, student activities, professional growth. -14
(5) Follow the evaluation method detailed below. b. Schedule

(1) The probationary faculty member shall be evaluated on the following schedule: 1st Semester: Full Evaluation

Recommendation to maintain or terminate employment 2nd Semester: Full Evaluation

Recommendation to rehire for one year, or not to rehire 3rd Semester: Full Evaluation 4th Semester: Optional Evaluation

Recommendation to hire for 2 years or not to hire
5th Semester: Full Evaluation
6th Semester: Optional Evaluation
7th Semester: Full Evaluation
8th Semester: Optional Evaluation

Recommendation to grant tenure or termination

(2) Written recommendations to terminate employment or re-employ will be presented to the Superintendent/President for forwarding to Board of Trustees. These recommendations must show the rationale for the Committee's decision.

(3) Notification of termination must be delivered to the probationary faculty member by March 15.
Failure to deliver notification by that date will be deemed as intent to rehire.

(4) Note: This timetable is designed for a new faculty member hired to begin working at the college in the Fall Semester. Should the new faculty member begin in the spring Semester, the first year of the new hire will become a three-semester process. The probationary faculty member will be evaluated for four and one-half years.

3. Evaluation Methods

a. The following procedure is for teaching faculty:

(1) Self Evaluation: Each instructor will prepare a written self evaluation report and present copies to all committee members one week before the review conference. The report shall include, but may not be limited to: (a) Objectives for the continued improvement of instruction based on the relationship of instruction to the course objectives, the results of the student survey, student achievement, and whatever else the evaluatee deems relevant. (b) Professional growth activities. (c) To what extent the objectives for the improvement of instruction stated in the evaluatee's last report (if it exists) have been met.

(2) Peer and Administration Evaluation: The evaluation team will, individually or together, visit the evaluatee's classes. Number and dates of the visitations will be established at the initial conference. Any visitation will be for entire length of that particular session. Written reports of the visitations will be made independently by the team members and copies will be given to the evaluatee at least three days before the review conference.

---

5. Challenge Process

a. Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny any probationary faculty members any grievance rights established under the California Education Code.

b. If a faculty member wishes to be removed from the Tenure Evaluation Committee, he/she must petition the division chair or Academic Senate, stating the reason for wishing to be released. If the reason has merit, and if there is no objection by the probationary faculty member, then the faculty member may be released from the Tenure Evaluation Committee. Another faculty member will be appointed to fill the vacancy.

c. A probationary faculty member has the right to make one challenge, without cause, to remove a member of the Evaluation Committee. This challenge may be made at any time in the tenure evaluation process, but can be exercised only once during the entire tenure evaluation process. The challenge must be delivered to the Division Chair, Academic Senate President or the Superintendent/ President. The challenged committee member will be replaced by a new member appointed by the division chair, Academic Senate President or Superintendent/ President.

d. If the probationary faculty member feels that his/her Evaluation Review Committee has failed to follow the guidelines

and procedures of the tenure evaluation procedure, the faculty member may request that a board be appointed to review the faculty member's tenure evaluation procedure. (1) The probationary faculty member may request the meeting of the review board through the COCFA President and the Academic Senate President.
(2) If an acceptable resolution cannot be reached, the review board will forward its report to the Superintendent/President. The probationary faculty retains the right to enter into the grievance procedure outlined in this contract.

B. procedures for Evaluation of Regular (Tenured) Instructors
Every regular (tenured) employee in the District will be evaluated once every four (4) years. The employees to be evaluated in a given semester will be selected and notified prior to the start of the semester in which the evaluation is to take place by the Office of Instruction. Regular instructors may be subject to formal evaluation procedures at a time other than the normal evaluation cycle if grounds exist for doing so, and if at least one semester has passed since the last formal evaluation. The legitimacy of the grounds for subjecting a regular instructor a formal evaluation outside the normal cycle will be decided upon by a committee composed of the Chief Instructional Officer, Chair of the faculty member's division, and the COCFA President. The evaluation team shall consist of the following: Chief Instructional Officer, division chair,
full-time faculty member in the discipline of the evaluatee. If a full-time faculty member does not exist, then one shall be chosen in a related discipline. In the event that the subject faculty member is a division chair, another division chair will be drawn by lot, and that Chair will sit on the committee. In the event that the subject faculty member is the COCFA President, the COCFA Vice President will sit on the committee. A majority of the committee must concur with the decision to formally evaluate outside the normal cycle.

1. Evaluation Team The team will consist of one (1) regular instructor agreeable to the evaluatee and the Chief Instructional Officer and the Chief Instructional Officer or Designee. The regular instructor shall serve as chairperson.

2. Initial Conference Same as Section A.2. with the exception that one (1) or more courses that he/she is currently teaching and has not been recently evaluated shall be submitted.

3. Evaluation Methods a. Peer Evaluation

Same as Section A.3.a.(2). b. Self-Evaluation

Same as Section A.3.b.(1). c. Student Evaluation

Same as Section A.3.c.(3).

4. Review Conference

Same as Section A.4.

College of the Redwoods, CA (CA062.TXT)

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR TEACHING FACULTY

I. NON TENURED FULL-TIME TEACHING FACULTY

A. TIMING & APPOINTMENT OF PEER EVALUATORS Non-tenured, full-time teaching faculty will at a minimum be evaluated for the first two semesters of employment and, then, each Fall semester until tenured. Two peers will be selected; one by the Division Chairperson/Director/other campus Dean' and the other by the faculty member to be evaluated. If there is a conflict of choice for the peer evaluator by either the faculty member or the Chairperson/Dean, the issue will be resolved by the Peer Review Committee'. The faculty member is encouraged to consider selecting a peer from outside the division/department. Each peer will visit and evaluate a minimum of two class presentations. Conclusions regarding the evaluations will be reported to the Chairperson/Dean on the standard peer evaluation form. Peers will also evaluate instructional materials (including course syllabi and tests).

B. STUDENT EVALUATIONS There will be student, evaluations conducted using the standard Student Evaluation Form or an approved alternative form'. Student and peer evaluations will be conducted during the fourth through sixth weeks of instruction. With the instructor absent, student evaluations will be administered and collected by the Division Chairpersons/Directors/other campus Deans and/or peer evaluators, using a standard set of instructions developed by the Chairperson/Dean. The Division Chairperson will conduct at least one classroom evaluation. All of these activities will be accomplished prior to the end of the sixth week of instruction. The Division Chairpersons/Directors/other campus Dean is responsible for collecting and tabulating all evaluation materials.

C. EVALUATION MEETING AND DESIGNATION As soon as all of the Evaluations have been completed and in any case no later than the eighth week of the semester, the instructor peer evaluators, Division Chairperson, and appropriate Dean shall meet at least once to review all evaluation, materials (including student evaluation comments) and discuss the instructor performance. The Instructor will be designated by a majority of the evaluators as either (1) to be evaluated during the next regular interval, (2)

to be evaluated during the next regular semester, or (3) to be reevaluated before the end of the current semester. All evaluation materials (forms A, B) D@ E, and a statistical summary of the Student Evaluation Form C), should be reviewed by the appropriate Dean or Vice President before being forwarded to the personnel file*.

D. RE-EVALUATION AND DESIGNATION If the recommendation is for "reevaluation before the end of the current semester, " a program 'for improvement and a process for reevaluation will be developed by a Reevaluation Team comprised of the Division Chairperson/Director/other campus Dean, the two peers from the initial evaluation team, and the appropriate Dean. Prior to the beginning of the next semester, the Reevaluation Team will recommend either (1) evaluation during the next regular semester or (2) contract non-renewal*. This recommendation will be forwarded to the "Peer Review Committee,"' and the Executive Vice President, Academic and Student Services. The "Peer Review Committee," after deliberation, will submit a report to the Executive Vice President by the end of the second week of the following semester corroborating or disagreeing with the Reevaluation Team's recommendations and making other recommendations as appropriate*. The Executive Vice President will review all evaluation materials and make a recommendation to the President and the Board, by the third week of the semester, for either (1) non-renewal of the teaching contract, or (2) renewal with further review*. (At each point in the process marked with an asterisk [*], the evaluates will be given an opportunity to review and respond to recommendations or other materials, placed in the personnel file.

II. TENURED TEACHING FACULTY (PHASE 1)

A. TIMING, APPOINTMENT OF PEER EVALUATORS AND STUDENT EVALUATION On alternate years, during either the fall or the spring semester of the academic year, two peers will be selected, one by the Division Chairperson/Director/other campus Dean' and one by the faculty member to be evaluated. If there is a conflict of choice for the peer evaluator by either the faculty member or the Chairperson/other campus Dean, the issue will be resolved by the Peer Review Committee. The faculty member is encouraged to consider selecting a peer from outside of the division/department. Each peer and the Chairperson/other campus Dean will visit and evaluate a minimum of one class presentation. Peers will also evaluate instructional materials (including course syllabi and tests). Conclusions regarding the evaluations will be reported to the Chairperson/other campus Dean on the Peer Evaluation Form. There will be student evaluations conducted using the Student Evaluation Form or an approved alternative'. Student Evaluation Forms will be administered during the fourth through sixth weeks of instruction. With the instructor absent, Student Evaluation Forms will be administered and collected by the Chairperson/other campus Dean and/or peer evaluators using instructions developed by the Chairperson/other campus Dean. The

Chairperson/other campus Dean is responsible for collecting and tabulating all evaluation materials.

B. EVALUATION MEETING AND DESIGNATION

After all evaluations have been completed, the instructor peer evaluators, and Division Chairperson/Director/other campus Dean shall meet at least once, prior to the eleventh week of instruction, to review all evaluation materials (including student evaluation comments) and discuss the instructor performance. By majority consensus, the Evaluation Team will recommend one of the following options: 1) evaluation at the next regular interval, 2) limited reevaluation during the following academic year - to review specified areas of concern, or 3) initiation of Phase II evaluation procedures. All evaluation materials (Forms A, B, D, E, and a statistical summary of Student Evaluation Form Q should be reviewed by the appropriate other campus Dean or Executive Vice President, Academic and Student Services, before being forwarded to the personnel file*.

III. PHASE II

A. PHASE II TEAM AND ACTIVITIES The Phase 11 evaluation team will be comprised of the division chairperson', appropriate dean, and both of the Phase I peer evaluators. The Evaluatee in Phase II will meet with this team to discuss the evaluation and areas of concern that exist. Specific written recommendations and a timeline for improvement will be developed. Phase 11 activities may include but are not limited to: gathering additional evaluations, approving lesson plans, appointing a mentor, requiring psychological and/or medical counseling, requiring additional course work. The recommendations will include a schedule of subsequent meetings to determine compliance and progress.

B. PEER REVIEW NOTIFICATION The Peer Review Committee must be notified of the initiation of any Phase II evaluations. It will monitor the progress of Phase 11 and have access to all evaluation information. All Phase I evaluation materials with a report of specific activities for improvement developed during Phase II will be forwarded to the Peer Review Committee.

C. PHASE II REPORTS, PEER REVIEW REPORTS AND DESIGNATIONS No later than January 15 of the academic year the Phase 11 Team will issue a report to the Executive Vice President, Academic and Student Services and to the Peer Review Committee. The report will detail what progress has been accomplished toward remediation and evaluate the instructor performance. If progress is satisfactory, the instructor returns to the normal evaluation rotation. If progress is unsatisfactory, the Executive Vice President will recommend dismissal and inform the Peer Review Committee*. Within ten days the Peer Review Committee, after deliberation, will submit Its report to the Executive Vice

President, Academic and Student Services, the evaluation team and the faculty member under review, corroborating or specifying areas of disagreement with the Phase 11 Team's and Executive Vice President's recommendations and making other recommendations as appropriate*. The Executive Vice President, Academic and Student Services will make recommendations based on the reports*. If the recommendation is for dismissal he will forward his decision to the President and Board of Trustees. If the recommendation is satisfactory, the employee will be evaluated at the next regular interval. If the recommendation is "perform a limited re-evaluation, " the Executive Vice President, Academic and Student Services, in consultation with the Phase 11 team shall direct how that will be done. If the Phase 11 team and the Executive Vice President think that the instructor difficulty may be related to some disability, it will so note and refer the matter to the Personnel office for further consideration. (At each point in the process marked with an asterisk [*], the evaluates will be given an opportunity to review and respond to recommendations, or other materials, placed in the personnel file.)

1 For faculty at Mendocino Coast and Del Norte, the center deans will act in the role of division chairperson.

2 If divisions or departments want to create their own standard student and/or peer evaluation forms, they can submit the forms to the Peer Evaluation Committee for approval.

3 Each spring a Peer Review Committee will be established for the following academic year. Rotation of two committee members will occur each year. The Peer Review Committee is comprised of three full time faculty selected by the Academic Senate from different divisions in the college. Their deliberations and conclusions are confidential. Their deliberations can include discussions with the appropriate dean, Executive Vice President, Academic and Student Services, appropriate division chairperson, and peer evaluators. The Peer Review Committee also reviews and authorizes the use of alternative or supplemental student and/or peer evaluation forms upon request.

Contra Costa Community College, CA (CA010.TXT)

ARTICLE 17

EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEES
17.1 General.

17.1.1 Once every two (2) academic years for regular certificated employees, the president of the college, or his/her designee, shall meet with each employee for

evaluation and review of contractual and statutory obligations.

17.4 First- and Second-Year Contract Faculty (Instructors).

Phase II. Peer evaluation of contract certificated persons shall be conducted by up to three (3) regular members chosen by the evaluatee, covering progress in fulfilling job description, reasonable expertise in subject matter, instructional strategies, and educational goals. This evaluation will include class visits and may include an examination of course teaching plans and materials.

Phase VI. The president's evaluation shall consist of a summation and review of all evaluation input of the peer, administrative, student, and self-evaluation, president's classroom visits, and the formal recommendation for or against reemployment.

Appeals. Each contract certificated faculty member shall have the right to appeal through appropriate channels to any of the following individuals or groups to either seek assistance or register objections to any evaluation report or process.

A. Peer evaluators.
B. Department, Area, or Division Chairperson.
C. Professional Concerns or Grievance Committees.
D. The college deans.
E. The college president.
F. The Chancellor.
G. The Governing Board.

County College of Morris, NJ (NJ005.TXT)

ARTICLE VII continued:

H. Peer Evaluation

The peer evaluation shall be conducted by a colleague, tenured or non-tenured, exclusive of the department chairpersons, selected by the faculty member seeking evaluation. The evaluator shall prepare a written report based upon the criteria set forth in Section D. In addition, if appropriate, the evaluator shall make specific suggestions for the improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness and/or other criteria outlined in Section D.1 of this Article. Copies of the evaluator's report shall be forwarded no later than February 1 to the department chairperson, the Promotion Procedure Committee, and the evaluated faculty member.

ARTICLE XX PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

The purpose of this Article is to improve instruction, counseling, and other educational services assigned by the District through the periodic evaluation of contract, regular, Part-Time, and Full-Time Temporary Faculty Members. All matters described in this section relating to tenure and to evaluation process guidelines are in conformance with the current Education Code.

(b) Requirements,

The evaluation will consist of (1) a self-evaluation, (2) student evaluations, (3) a peer evaluation, and (4) the evaluation by the Dean. The peer evaluation will include (1) a review of the student evaluation which will be administered by the Dean or Designee, (2) classroom or work site visitation by the evaluator and the Dean, (3) a conference with the evaluates, and (4) copies of the conference report to be provided to the evaluates, Dean, and the appropriate Vice President who will forward it to the evaluatee's permanent personnel file.

(c) Panel.

During the first and second semester evaluations, the evaluation will be conducted by two regular Faculty Members, one of' whom must be from the hiring committee, and the Dean, Associate Dean, or Director. Thereafter, the evaluation will be conducted by a Full-Time Faculty Member and the Dean, Associate Dean, or Director as appropriate. The peer evaluator(s) will be chosen by the Dean from the evaluatee's discipline. If the peer evaluator(s) is not acceptable to the evaluates, the Dean and the senior representative of the Academic Senate from the division will choose three names of Full-Time Faculty Members in the following priority of selection, first from the evaluatee's discipline, second from the evaluatee's department, and third from the division The evaluates will then choose one to serve as the peer evaluator. The purpose of this panel is to assess the teaching effectiveness of the evaluates and other duties, including committee work, appropriate to a contract Faculty Member as defined by this Agreement and to ascertain if the evaluatee's total performance is satisfactory, needs improvement, or is unsatisfactory

(d) Special Responsibilities.

The hiring committee which recommended the hiring of the contract Faculty Member shall set forth in writing those special

responsibilities applicable to the position for which the contract Faculty Member was employed and upon which the contract Faculty Member shall be evaluated in addition to the responsibilities generally outlined in Appendix A, Position Description - Instructor. The Dean shall provide the contract Faculty Member with a copy of such special responsibilities at the time of employment.

(g) Peer Evaluation-All members of the evaluation panel are required to make at least one (1) classroom or other work-site observation, with prior notice to the evaluates, each semester of evaluation and complete a report prepared on a standardized form prepared by the Evaluation Procedures Committee. The Dean, Associate Dean, or Director has the prerogative to make a classroom visit at any time.

(i) If the Faculty Member is identified with an overall rating of "unsatisfactory" per subsection (i) of this section, a new evaluation team will be selected. The team shall include the Vice President - Academic Affairs, who shall chair the team, the Dean of the division, four (4) regular Faculty Members, and if requested by either the Dean or the evaluates, a non-voting affirmative action representative. Two (2) of the regular Faculty Members are to be appointed by the President of the Academic Senate from the contract Faculty Member's division and two (2) are to be appointed by the President of the Federation from the faculty at large. The Faculty Member will be afforded all protections under this Agreement and applicable Education Code provisions.

(ii) The purpose of the panel described in subsection (k) above is to review the work of the previous panel and conduct any additional investigations the panel views as appropriate, including additional classroom observations, student and/or peer surveys, and conferences with the Faculty Member to discuss their findings and recommendation.

(iii) The evaluation team shall prepare a written report with recommendations, which report will be signed by the Faculty Member and by each member of the evaluation team. The Vice President, Academic Affairs, may assign the drafting of the report to a member of the team. If the evaluation team concludes that the Faculty Member has made the necessary improvement, the evaluation will be determined to be overall "satisfactory." If at least four (4) members of the evaluation team conclude that the Faculty Member has not made sufficient improvement, the committee shall recommend to the President that the contract Faculty Member not be issued a contract. A tied vote will mean that the Faculty Member will be retained. A full report shall be prepared and submitted to the President in support of the recommendation. This report must be submitted at least fifteen (I 5) working days

prior to March 15.

(iv) If the contract Faculty Member or any member of the team does not concur with the conference report, such individual may submit a written signed statement of dissent, which statement shall include the reasons for the disagreement.

Feather River Community College, CA (CA014.TXT)

---

1. The arbitrator shall have no power to:

---

ii. Any matter of unit member evaluation other than failure to comply with procedures or procedural aspects;

F. The Evaluation of Faculty Members

The evaluation process shall consist of peer, student, and administration evaluation.

1. Peer Evaluation Process: The evaluation panel will elect its own chairperson. The composition and selection of the panel shall be: two regular faculty member selected by the evaluee and one regular faculty member selected by lot from within the general faculty.

Panel members shall not be informed of their selection until the full composition of the panel is finalized.

---

2. Each faculty member being evaluated shall prepare a self-evaluation report and present such report to the panel.

3. The evaluation panel's report shall consider the faculty member's performance in meeting the responsibilities of his/her position.

4. At least one conference shall be held with the faculty member by the evaluation panel.

5. A written report of the findings of the panel will be prepared by the panel chairperson and signed by the faculty member (Faculty member's signature acknowledges only that he/she has received and read the report.), as well as, in the case of unanimity, by each member of the panel. The report will be submitted to the chief

academic officer with two (2) copies to the faculty member and a copy to the district personnel office file.

6. If there is not unanimous agreement by the committee members, individual reports may be submitted with copies to the evaluee.

7. The form to be used for this process can be found in the Appendix.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING #6

Evaluation of Full-time Faculty

1. To conform to the Education Code which requires departmental or divisional composition of the peer review panel, the parties agree to the following recording for Article 12, Section F, paragraph 1.

Peer Evaluation Process: The evaluation panel will elect i.s own chairperson. The composition and selection of the panel shall be two regular faculty members selected by the evaluee, one will be from the instructional division or student services to which the evaluee is assigned and one may be from the faculty at large. The third member will be selected by lot from the instructional division or student services to which the evaluee is assigned. The evaluee has the right to reject the first faculty member selected by lot. If this right is exercised. a second faculty member will be chosen by lot. This selection will be final.

2. Because an instrument for student evaluation has not been agreed upon by the parties per the contract, the parties agree that:

Evaluation of those faculty_members due to be evaluated in 1990-91 be delayed until 1991-92 but will be designated as the 1990-91 evaluation. Faculty members so affected will be reevaluated in two years rather than three years consistent with their original evaluation schedule.

Gavilan Community College, CA (CA065.TXT)

19.2.2 PEER EVALUATION: THE FACULTY MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM WILL MAKE CLASS VISITS WHICH WILL BE SUMMARIZED IN A WRITTEN REPORT. THE FOLLOWING ARE GENERAL CRITERIA THAT WILL BE USED IN THE EVALUATION:

EXPERTISE IN SUBJECT MATTER OR PROFESSIONAL FIELD.

EFFECTIVENESS IN CARRYING OUT DUTIES IN INSTRUCTION, COUNSELING, LIBRARY, OR ENABLING, AS APPROPRIATE FOR THE UNIT MEMBER'S ASSIGNMENT.

ACCEPTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH STUDENTS AND STAFF.

PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMITTEES, PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES, ADVISOR TO STUDENT CLUBS OR ORGANIZATIONS.

19.3 EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION: THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE WILL CONSIST OF FOUR (4) CERTIFICATED PERSONS: ONE FACULTY MEMBER, ONE ADMINISTRATOR, AND THE PRESIDENT OF GCFA AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY SENATE OR THEIR DESIGNEES. THE ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE, WHO IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE FOR SEEING THE PROCESS THROUGH TO ITS CONCLUSION, WILL BE APPOINTED BY THE DEAN OF INSTRUCTION.

THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED WILL SELECT A COLLEAGUE TO CARRY OUT THE PEER EVALUATION.

THE EVALUATING PEER SHALL BE EMPLOYED WITHIN THE G.C.F.A. UNIT. THE EVALUATING PEER WILL MAKE AT LEAST ONE CLASS VISITATION WITH A SECOND VISITATION BEING MANDATED AT THE REQUEST OF THE EVALUATEE. THE VISTTATION(S) WILL BE SUMMARIZED IN A WRITTEN REPORT AND THE PEER WILL PRESENT AND DISCUSS THE WRITTEN REPORT WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED.

A FINAL WRITTEN REPORT WILL BE GIVEN TO THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED, BUT NOT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM. THE PEER EVALUATION REPORT WILL NOT BE FILED IN THE FACULTY MEMBER"S PERSONNEL FILE, UNLESS THE EVALUATEE MAKES THE REQUEST AND PROVIDES THE DOCUMENT.

THE SUMMARY EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR CONTINUATION OF FACULTY STATUS SHALL BE MADE SOLELY BY THE RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATOR. THE DISTRICT AGREES TO INDEMNITY AND HOLD HARMLESS ANY FACULTY MEMBER AGAINST ANY AND ALL CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF ANY PEER EVALUATION CONDUCTED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ARTICLE.

THE SECOND STEP OF PEER EVALUATION, WHICH TREATS FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE, WILL BE CARRIED OUT BY THE PRESIDENT OF GCFA AND THE FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT OR THEIR DESIGNEES. THEIR REPORT WILL BE SHARED WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER FOR REVIEW AND RESPONSE.

19.6 THE DESIGN OF FORMS AND QUESTIONNAIRES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION AND TENURE REVIEW WILL BE CREATED JOINTLY BY THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE IN COOPERATION WITH THE ADMINISTRATION.

19.7 NON-SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURAL ERRORS SHALL NOT INVALIDATE THE EVALUATION OR TENURE RECOMMENDATION UNLESS THE ERRORS ARE PREJUDICIAL ERRORS.

Glendale Community College, CA (CA066.TXT)

ARTICLE IX EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Administrative Dean of Human Resources shall coordinate an evaluation schedule with the Executive Vice President, Instructional Services. For each tenured regular instructional faculty to be evaluated, an Evaluation Committee shall be established, composed of the employee's division chairperson, a volunteer peer instructor selected by the employee, and the appropriate Vice President, or a designee. The administrator shall serve as Chairperson. When a Division Chairperson is being evaluated as an instructor, the Committee shall be composed of the Executive Vice President, Instructional Services or designee and a peer selected by the Division Chairperson. All peer evaluators must be tenured and have received a satisfactory rating in their last evaluation, and shall normally be from the same discipline, if possible, or division as the employee being evaluated.

The Evaluation Committee shall attempt to assess the employee's overall performance, including teaching ability, subject matter competence, participation in campus life, and meeting the established performance factors and standards for evaluation.

Section 3. Observations and Conferences.

Each Evaluation Committee member shall conduct as many classroom observations as deemed necessary to assess the effectiveness of the instructor. Prior notification of the visits shall be given. Within ton (10) working days following an observation, the

observer shall complete the District Evaluation Form and forward it to the employee with copies to the other Committee members. Committee members may consult together periodically to discuss the employee s performance and progress. When there are indications from one or more Committee members that the employee is not meeting to expected level of Performance, assistance and counseling shall be provided. Such assistance/counseling may include, but is not limited to, consulting and advising from Committee members or others; requiring the employee to observe other instructors or engage in independent reading; providing a review of the employee's lecture materials, and the like.

Section 4. Final Evaluation.

I Prior to February 1 t a final evaluation conference between the Committee and the employee shall be held. All items in the evaluation procedures shall be reviewed.

If all Committee members agree that the instructor's performance is satisfactory, the evaluation process shall be deemed completed. If one or more Committee members find that the employee's work is "unsatisfactory," the Evaluation Committee shall convene a special meeting of the Committee to attempt to arrive at a consensus. A "Composite Faculty Evaluation Rating Sheet' shall be completed by the Committee as a whole, and the employee shall have the right to append to the form(s) a written statement containing his/her views of the situation. The current evaluation forms are attached hereto as Appendix "G." Any changes in the forms must be subject to consultation with the Guild. If, after completion of the above meetings, any Committee member concludes with an "unsatisfactory" rating of the employee, the reports of all Committee members and the evaluation forms shall be sent to the appropriate vice president, who shall immediately notify the Administrative Dean of Human Resources and the Superintendent/President to develop a final written decision and to determine further action as deemed appropriate, including possible discipline or termination (pursuant to applicable law) and/or reevaluation for the following year. The Superintendent/President shall also determine whether the negative evaluation is to be placed in the employee's personnel file. All written records, findings, and reports shall be housed in the Office of Human Resources.

Hartnell Community College, CA (CA200.TXT)

ARTICLE 13. EVALUATION OF REGULAR (TENURED) ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

7

D. PROCEDURES

1. The evaluation shall be coordinated by the faculty

member's direct supervisor. The direct supervisor shall conduct work site observations and complete the supervisor's evaluation report.

2. The evaluates shall select a peer faculty member, from the same or a closely related discipline to perform the Peer Evaluation.

a. Each faculty member shall be required to perform up to 2 peer evaluations per academic year on other full-time faculty.

b. A faculty member may decline to evaluate -one faculty member per semester, if selected as the peer evaluator. The requirement of up to 2 evaluations per year may still be required of that faculty member.

3. Notification of intent to evaluate

a. Prior to September' 30th, the District must notify, in writing, any instructor who is to be evaluated during the upcoming academic year.

b. A pre-evaluation conference between the instructor, the peer evaluator and the District supervisor shall be held prior to the evaluation process beginning.

4. Pre-evaluation Conference

a. Prior to the pre-evaluation conference being held, a copy of this procedure shall be sent to the evaluates, including all forms.

b. The purpose of the conference shall be to discuss the standards and procedures upon which the evaluation will be based and coordinate the peer evaluation.

5. Direct Supervisor, Peer Evaluator and Evaluatee Responsibilities

a. The direct supervisor shall be responsible for: (1) performing work site observation (s) ; (2) providing the student appraisal forms;(3)preparing the supervisor evaluation report and (4) coordinating the peer evaluation.

b. The evaluates is responsible for: (1) providing samples of instructional materials, such as class outlines, study guides, examinations, syllabi, etc; (2) a professional growth report, a report of college-related activities, and a self-appraisal may be included as part of the evaluation process (forms attached); and (3) selecting the peer evaluator from the same or a closely related discipline.

c. The peer evaluator shall be responsible for: (1) meeting and discussing evaluation objectives; (2) performing work

site observations(s); and (3) preparing the peer work site observation report(s).

6. Components of the Evaluation

a. Work Site Observations

The direct supervisor and the peer evaluator shall observe the work performance of the evaluates on at least one occasion. The evaluators shall give advance notice of his/her primary observation. Each observation shall be summarized on a work site observation form. The work site observation form is attached as an exhibit.

---

f. Peer Evaluation

The purpose of Peer Review evaluations is to serve to improve instructional skills and not to form the basis for any employment dismissal. The peer evaluator shall use the forms from Appendix C and complete the work site observation form using the criteria identified in 13.C.1 & 2. The peer evaluator shall follow the procedures in 13.D., except no overall performance rating shall be given.

---

c. The peer evaluation report shall consist of the work site observation form. A copy of the completed peer evaluation report shall be given to the evaluates. The Supervisor's report shall be forwarded to the Personnel Office and at that time a copy of the peer evaluation report shall be attached to it and placed in the evaluatee's file.

H. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Refusal of the evaluates to participate in any element of the evaluation shall release the District, other members of the evaluation team and members of the Tenure Review Committee, from the obligation to complete that part of the evaluation, and may result in termination of the individual's employment contract.

2. Non-substantive procedural errors shall not constitute cause for invalidating the evaluation unless the errors are prejudicial errors.

---

b. Not included in this definition of grievance is a complaint which may, or should as interpreted by the District, be appealed or redressed through some other complaint, appellant, or

redress process.

Highlire Community College, WA (WA013.TXT)

---

308 TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION

308.1 Goals

The purpose of this section is to provide a faculty evaluation system that promotes high educational quality and encourages the collegial openness and sharing that characterizes the relationships among the college's faculty. The college supports the professional development of its faculty and the faculty's concern with improving the quality of their professional work. The goals of the faculty evaluation are to:

1. Promote ongoing professional growth and skill enhancement.
2. Maintain the quality of education.
3. Meet the requirements of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges and the state law.

(The purpose of this section is not in any way to affect the processes related to the granting, the maintenance or removal of tenure. Sections 400 and 500 of this agreement covers the processes related to tenure.)

308.2 Organizing and Scheduling Teams

308.2.1 Schedule of Faculty Evaluees

Every full-time tenured faculty member will be evaluated once every three years. Approximately one-third of the tenured faculty will be evaluated every year. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify the faculty who are to be evaluated by the end of winter quarter of the preceding year.

Should a leave, illness or alternate appointment preclude a faculty member from completing the evaluation process during the year, will complete the evaluation process in the subsequent year. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet with the evaluee and will schedule a reasonable completion time.

308.2.2 Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will assist each faculty member in completing the evaluation process. The team will consist of the following:

1. The faculty member being evaluated.

2. At least one Highline peer from the same or a related discipline. The faculty evaluee may recommend an additional peer(s) from another accredited institution of higher education or a vocational practitioner(s).

3. One Highline administrator.

308.2.3 Appointing of Evaluation Team

By the end of the first week of fall quarter, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will send a reminder to faculty to be evaluated during the current year and ask for recommendations of team members from each evaluee. By the end of the second week, each evaluee will send to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a list of suggested team members. The evaluee should get the consent of the suggested team member before sending the list to the Vice President. By the end of the third week, the College President will appoint all administrators to the tenured faculty evaluation teams and the Vice President for Academic Affairs will confirm membership of each team.

308.3 Evaluation Process

308.3.1 Initial Meeting

The administrative member of each team will schedule the first meeting to be held before the end of the fourth week of the quarter. By the conclusion of this meeting each team will select its chair and prepare a brief outline of the team's tentative plan for evaluation and time lines. The chair will submit a copy of this tentative plan to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and to all team members by Monday of the fifth week . The Vice President for Academic Affairs will approve each plan's schedule to ensure that the process, including completed portfolio and summary report, will be completed by the end of April.

308.3.2 Factors of Evaluation

Since teaching and learning are complex, subtle processes, the results of which are not entirely observable, known or measurable, a variety of aspects and materials should be reviewed by the instructor and members of his or her team. Depending upon the nature of the discipline and the courses, programs or services the evaluee is responsible for, the faculty evaluee and his or her team will determine precisely what materials will be reviewed and what kinds of activities will most appropriately be undertaken during the process of evaluation. However, the evaluation process should include a review of the following materials and information, as the evaluation team agrees are applicable and would contribute to the evaluation process:

1. Student evaluations.
2. Self-evaluations.
3. Peer evaluations.

4. Administrator evaluations.
5. Division chair evaluations.
6. Syllabi for courses normally taught by the instructor.
7. Organization of these courses.
8. Required and supplementary texts or supplies purchased by the students.
9. Teaching or advising or counseling materials such as supplementary handouts, tests, quizzes, assignments.
10. Discussion of teaching, advising, or counseling methods and strategies.
11. Observation of the instructor's interaction with students in the relevant education setting.
12. Professional standards.
13. Divisional or departmental tenure standards.
14. Service to the profession, college and community.
15. Lists of scholarly readings, writings and other research.

3083 2.1 Evaluation Instruments

308.3.2.1.2 Other Evaluation Forms

If a team wants to use standardized forms for evaluations by peers, self, division chairs, or administrators. such forms are available in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

308.3.3.1 Portfolio

Individual faculty evaluees have the responsibility of developing and implementing their own evaluation plans with the advice and consent of their evaluation teams. The minimum process will be the production of an evaluation portfolio. The portfolio may include awards received, PDU's, credit course grades, professional credentials, conference attendance, independent research, syllabi, teaching or counseling materials developed by the instructor, and any other information helpful to the process. Faculty evaluees are encouraged to collect and organize data during the year preceding the evaluation. The portfolio must contain the following completed items for the division chair or designated person* to certify the process is completed:

1. Team member names.
2. The approved evaluation plan.
3. The summary of the student evaluations.
4. Evaluations by each team member.
5. Self-evaluation.
6. Individual faculty development plan, if applicable.
7. Team's summary report

(The designated person in ABE is the Director of Continuing Education. The designated person for a division chair is the

appropriate Dean. For librarians, the designated person is the Humanities chair. For Student Services faculty the designated person is the Vice President for Students.)

308.3.3.2 Team's Review

To prepare for completion of the evaluation process, the evaluee and his or her team should meet to review the process and be sure all the relevant materials are included in the portfolio. If the evaluation team identifies areas for improvement, the faculty evaluee will develop an individual faculty development plan with the consultation and approval of his or her team. This faculty development plan will be included in the portfolio. Prior to meeting with the division chair or designated person, the evaluation team shall prepare a report of the summary of the evaluation to include findings and recommendations.
When areas for needed improvement are identified and the faculty evaluation team develops an individual faculty development plan, the faculty evaluee will consult with the appropriate Vice President and seek approval of the plan prior to soliciting college support for it. The college will make reasonable efforts to provide resources that support faculty professional growth such as release time, material, tuition reimbursement, substitutes, consultants/trainers, faculty exchange programs, and professional leave programs. (See Section 600 of this agreement.)

308.3.3.3 Division Chair's Review

The evaluation process will be completed in April of the evaluation year by the faculty evaluee reviewing the final portfolio with the division chair or designated person. The division chair or designated person will assess the final evaluation material and the evaluation process for agreement with the requirements stated in 308.3.3.1. The division chair or designated person will submit a written report to the appropriate Vice President on the status of each evaluation process.

308.3.3.4 Vice President's Review

The appropriate Vice President shall review each evaluee's portfolio and summary report. The Vice President will, upon review of the portfolio, provide written notification to each evaluee before May 31 indicating the evaluee's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The appropriate Vice President or faculty evaluee may initiate a meeting to review the evaluation portfolio together.

If the Vice President, upon reviewing the portfolio, determines that the evaluee's performance is unsatisfactory, the Vice President must demonstrate that the faculty member's continued unsatisfactory performance will have a substantial detrimental effect on learning. The Vice President will discuss with the faculty evaluee, unsatisfactory performance. The evaluee may

request the right to representation at these meetings. After consulting with the Tenure Review Committee, the Vice President will develop a reasonable plan for remediation The Vice President will discuss this plan with the evaluee. The Vice President and the evaluee may, by mutual agreement, modify the remediation plan.

If the faculty evaluee does not complete the remedial activities as planned, the Vice President may initiate disciplinary proceedings.

The Vice President cannot initiate any disciplinary process merely upon review of an evaluation portfolio. Only if remediation has been identified and required and the faculty evaluee has not met the remediation requirements, can the appropriate Vice President initiate disciplinary action. Disciplinary action and faculty grievance processes are covered in Section 806 and 807 of this agreement.

308.4 Disposition of Records

Evaluation information is confidential. Two copies of the portfolio will be maintained, one by the faculty evaluee, and one by the appropriate Vice President. Completion of the portfolio is the responsibility of the faculty evaluee. Contents of the portfolio will be available to the team members during the evaluation process. Nothing will be added to the evaluee's portfolio after the final review by the appropriate Vice President. The portfolio may be reviewed at the next three-year evaluation. The new portfolio will replace the old portfolio in the office of the Vice President. It will be the responsibility of the Vice President to destroy the old portfolio.

Imperial Community College, CA (CA049.TXT)

ARTICLE X EVALUATION PROCEDURE Definitions

A "peer evaluator" means any regular employee who is selected by the person to be evaluated.

Matters of substance in a unit member's evaluation shall not be subject to the grievance procedure in this Agreement.

In order to address the principles of affirmative action and the demographics of California, a unit member may select a peer evaluator from outside the unit member's division in any evaluation when the last preceding peer evaluation was conducted by a peer from within the unit member's division.

A unit member being evaluated may choose to have simultaneous or separate peer and administrative pre-observation conferences, observations, and post-evaluation conferences.

Procedure

Initially, a member of the unit who is to be evaluated shall meet with the evaluators in a pre-observation conference, the purpose of which is to discuss, ascertain, and identify the ingredients and objectives of the evaluation, the time and conditions of the observation visitation, and the time of the post- observation conference.

The observation visitation shall take place within twenty-five (25) work days of the pre-observation conference. Observation visitations normally will be for periods of fifty (50) minutes; however, the period of time of an observation visitation may be shortened or lengthened by the mutual agreement of the unit member and the evaluators.

Extemporaneous notes may be taken during the observation visitation. Evaluation forms should be filled out during or immediately following the observation visitation.

In that the purpose of evaluation is the improvement of instruction, positive instructional features observed during the observation visitation should receive as much, if not more, emphasis than negative features.

The post-evaluation conference shall take place within twenty (20) work days of the observation visitation. Within fifteen (15) work days of the observation visitation, the evaluators shall submit to the unit member being evaluated a copy of the completed evaluation form which may include any extemporaneous notes taken during the observation visitation.

Lake Tahoe Community College, CA (CA054.TXT)

APPENDIX 5

TENURE REVIEW AND
TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

B. Evaluation Team for Full-Time Faculty

1. The Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services will establish faculty evaluation teams in consultation with the Academic Senate President.

2. Evaluation teams will be composed of a peer evaluator, the supervising administrator, and the faculty member to be evaluated. When possible, the peer evaluator will be from the discipline of the faculty member to be evaluated or a related area and may be an adjunct faculty member. An appropriate professional in the field may be asked to assist the team and provide technical expertise when necessary.

3. The faculty member being evaluated may request through the team administrator that the peer evaluator be replaced with someone of his/her choice, providing the individual is willing to participate and has approval of the administrator. Where differences exist, the Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services will decide in consultation with the Academic Senate President.

4. A list of evaluation team members will be sent to the Academic Senate President and other appropriate individuals using Form A: Faculty Evaluation Teams and Form B: Notice of Evaluation.

---

1. Full-Time Faculty Evaluation Process

a. Pre-observation Meeting

(1) The peer evaluator, administrator, and faculty member will meet to review the evaluation procedures and timelines, discuss materials needed from the faculty member and their due date, and select classes to be observed.

(2) Materials to be prepared/completed by the faculty member and submitted to the peer evaluator and the administrator by the due date noted above include:

(a) written self-assessment and objectives following the format of Form C: Self Assessment and Objectives;

(b) syllabi, course outlines, and tests/exams/quizzes from classes to be observed (materials from other courses may be provided if the faculty member so chooses); and

(c) supplemental materials as appropriate.

b. Classroom Observations

(1) The peer evaluator and the administrator will each observe at least one of the instructor's classes. The classes to be visited will be mutually agreed upon by the team at the time of the pre-observation meeting.

(2) For each class visited, the peer evaluator and administrator will each document the observation using the criteria contained

in Form F: Evaluation Summary as a guide.

---

(2) During the formal evaluation process, peer and administrator evaluators will conduct student evaluations in each class visited using Form D. Results will then be compiled, reviewed, and summarized.

d. Evaluation Write-Up

(1) Following the classroom observations, the peer evaluator and administrator will meet to review and discuss:

(a) faculty member's written self-assessment and objectives;

(b) class materials (syllabi; course outlines; tests/exams/quizzes; supplemental materials);

(c) student evaluations from current and past quarters; and

(d) classroom observations.

(2) The peer evaluator and administrator will jointly complete Form E: Review of Class Materials and Self-Assessment/Objectives.

(3) The peer evaluator and administrator will jointly complete Form F: Evaluation Summary.

(4) The peer evaluator and administrator will jointly complete Form G: Certification of Completion/Recommendation.

e. Summary Meeting

(1) Following completion of the evaluation write-up, the peer evaluator, administrator, and faculty member will meet a final time to review and discuss:

(a) classroom observations, student evaluations, self-assessment and objectives, and the completed Forms E and F; and

(b) the narrative attached to Form F noting commendations, overall assessment of performance, recommended performance enhancements, and the level of accomplishment of previous recommendations and objectives.

(2) During the summary meeting, the peer evaluator and administrator will review Form G: Certification of Completion/Recommendation with the faculty member.

(a) If the final recommendation by the peer evaluator and administrator is a Needs Improvement performance evaluation on Form G. then a remediation plan addressing noted deficiencies and areas needing improvement will be

developed by the entire team and attached to the evaluation packet. The date of the next evaluation will be set by the evaluation team.

(b) If the final recommendation by the peer evaluator and administrator is an Unsatisfactory performance evaluation on Form G. then a remediation plan addressing noted deficiencies and areas needing improvement will be developed by the entire team and attached to the evaluation packet. The date of the next evaluation will be set by the evaluation team.

(c) An Unsatisfactory performance evaluation will result in a recommendation that the faculty member not be eligible for a step increase until a subsequent evaluation results in a finding of Satisfactory or Needs Improvement.

(d) An Unsatisfactory performance evaluation on the most recent evaluation will result in the faculty member's subsequent Professional Development Leave plan being developed jointly with the supervising administrator using the remediation plan as a guide.

(e) All evaluation team members will sign Form G. Faculty signature indicates an awareness of the evaluation report only. The person being evaluated is not required to agree or disagree with the recommendations. The faculty member may, at his or her discretion, attach written comments as indicated on Form G.

(f) if the peer evaluator does not agree with portions of the evaluation, he/she may submit to the administrator a written statement indicating areas of disagreement which will be attached to the evaluation report and which will be available to the evaluated faculty member.

(g) if the peer evaluator and administrator do not agree on the final recommendation, then the evaluation documents will be reviewed by the Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services for final resolution.

---

c. Student Evaluations and Surveys

---

(4) The evaluation team is responsible for the development of the survey instruments and the processes and procedures for carrying out the survey and/or student evaluations.

d. Evaluation Write-up

(1) Following completion of the interviews and applicable surveys, the peer evaluator and administrator will meet to review

and discuss:

(a) written self-assessment and objectives;
(b) level of accomplishment of previous recommendations and objectives;
(c) written materials and documents submitted;
(d) student/staff/public survey results;
(e) overall performance assessment; and
(f) recommendations regarding performance enhancements.

(2) The peer evaluator and administrator will jointly develop a written narrative to encompass (a) - (f) above.

(3) The peer evaluator and administrator will jointly complete Form G.: Certification of Completion/Recommendation.

e. Summary Meeting
(1) Following completion of the evaluation write-up, the peer evaluator, administrator, and counselor, librarian, or director will meet a final time to review and discuss:

(a) interview results, student/staff/public survey results, self-assessment and objectives, materials and documents submitted, and the written narrative; and

(b) the recommendation contained in Form G.: Certificate of Completion/Recommendation.

(2) The following items pertain to the evaluation and recommendations contained in Form G: Certificate of Completion/Recommendation.

(a) If the final recommendation by the peer evaluator and administrator is a Needs Improvement performance evaluation on Form G. then a remediation plan addressing noted deficiencies and areas needing improvement will be developed by the entire team and attached to the evaluation packet. The date of the next evaluation will be set by the evaluation team.
(b) If the final recommendation by the peer evaluator and administrator is an Unsatisfactory performance evaluation on Form G. then a remediation plan addressing noted deficiencies and areas needing improvement will be developed by the entire team and attached to the evaluation packet. The date of the next evaluation will be set by the evaluation team.
(c) An Unsatisfactory performance evaluation will result in a recommendation that the faculty member not be eligible for a step increase until a subsequent evaluation results in a finding of Satisfactory or Needs Improvement.
(d) An Unsatisfactory performance evaluation on the most recent evaluation will result in the faculty member's subsequent Professional Development Leave plan being developed jointly with

the supervising administrator using the remediation plan as a guide.

(e) All evaluation team members will sign Form G. Faculty signature indicates an awareness of the evaluation report only. The person being evaluated is not required to agree or disagree with the recommendations. The faculty member may, at his or her discretion, attach written comments as indicated on Form G.

(f) If the peer evaluator does not agree with portions of the evaluation, he/she may submit to the administrator a written statement indicating areas of disagreement which will be attached to the evaluation report and which will be available to the evaluated faculty member.

(g) If the peer evaluator and administrator do not agree on the final recommendation, then the evaluation documents will be reviewed by the Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services for final resolution.

FORM E
LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TENURE REVIEW AND TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION
REVIEW OF CLASS MATERIALS AND SELF-ASSESSMENT/OBJECTIVES

Faculty Member Date
Evaluation Team Members: Peer Administrator

1. SYLLABUS (list course titles): Syllabus Available
   (1) Yes No
   (2) Yes No
   (3) Yes No
   (4) Yes No
   Comments:

2. TEST/EXAMS/QUIZZES

   Comments:

(OVER)

3. SUPPLEMENTAL Materials (handouts AV, etc.)

Comments:

4. COURSE OUTLINE (Full-time faculty)

Comments:

5. SELF-ASSESSMENT AND OBJECTIVES

Comments:

FORM F
LAKE TAHOE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TENURE REVIEW AND TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION
EVALUATION SUMMARY

Faculty Member — Quarter/Year
Discipline — Current Contract Status
Courses — Date of Visitations

Evaluation Team Members:

Administrator — Peer

E = Excellent I = Improvement Needed
AA = Above Average U. = Unsatisfactory
A = Average

1. Summary of Classroom Visitations	E	AA	A	I	U
a. Clarity of speech	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Class presentations planned and organized.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Knowledge of subject area.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Critical thinking and analysis encouraged of students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Rapport with students.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. Overall assessment of classroom visitations	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. Lesson objectives made clear.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

2. Narrative (attached to this form)

To include:

Overall assessment of performance

Commendations - strengths/accomplishments

Recommended performance enhancements - areas for improvement

Review of the level of accomplishment of previous recommendations and objectives.

Summary of student evaluations

6.2 Content 6.2.1 Faculty

6.2.1.1 Faculty will be evaluated by an administrator and two (2) Peer Evaluators.

6.2.1.2 A written self-evaluation will be prepared by the instructor to be reviewed by the three (3) evaluators.

6.2.1.3 The three (3) Evaluators will each make a classroom visit, as well as review class materials such as tests, quizzes, syllabus, and course outline for the class being reviewed.

6.3.2 Division Chairperson/Peer Evaluator

6.3.2.1 The Evaluators will attend a Pre-Evaluation Conference (see D below), carry out an in-class evaluation (where appropriate), conduct an interview, write salaries, and attend a Post Evaluation Conference, as appropriate. The student evaluation summaries, handout materials,self-evaluation and summary of professional responsibilities will also be reviewed.

6.3.3 Pre-Evaluation Conference

6.3.3.1 A Pre-Evaluation Conference will be scheduled by the Administration for the members of the evaluation team between the sixth and tenth weeks of the semester.

6.3.3.2 Prior to the Pre-Evaluation Conference,the faculty member to be evaluated will receive a written notice of the evaluation from the Administrator and will prepare to review and discuss the following at the conference:

6.3.3.1 Self-Evaluation and objectives

6.3.3.2 Syllabus and class materials for the class to be evaluated

6.3.3.3 The purpose of the Pre-Evaluation Conference is to review the evaluation process, arrange classroom visits, discuss the self-evaluation and objectives and review the syllabus/handout materials for the class to be evaluated, as appropriate.At the time the Administrator, in consultation with team members, will complete a, review of class materials and self-evaluation/objectives.

6.3.4 Classroom Visits - Faculty

6.3.4.1 Each Evaluator will visit and evaluate different meetings of the same class.Classroom visits will occur between the eleventh and fourteenth weeks of the semester. Evaluators have a responsibility to be on time.

6.3.4.2 With the instructor not present, and evaluator will supervise student, evaluations, during the last ten minutes of the class. Students will be advised that the instructor will be given a summary of results, but will not see the student evaluation forms until after final grades have been submitted.

6.3.4.3 The evaluators will each complete a, classroom visitation document.

6.3.5 Interviews - Counselors, Librarians and other Non-instructional Faculty

6.3.5.1 Counselors, Librarians, and other Non-instructional Faculty will be individually interviewed by each Evaluator to discuss work performance.

6.3.5.2 Whenever possible, the evaluator will supervise random student evaluations, concerning the counselors, librarians, and other Non-instructional faculty.

6.3.5.3 The results of the interview will be a narrative written by the Evaluators collectively.

6.3.6 Post Evaluation Conference

6.3.6.1 The evaluation team will meet as a follow-up to the classroom visits or interviews, Post-Evaluation conferences will be scheduled during the fifteenth and sixteenth weeks of the semester. Team members will review the results, comments, and recommendations to be included on a certification of completion and recommendations document, to!be completed by the Administrator for signature by the faculty member, and the Evaluators.

6.3.6.2 Faculty signature indicates awareness of evaluation report only. The person being evaluated is not required to agree or disagree wit the team's recommendations. The faculty member may include written comments as indicated on the evaluation forms.

6.3.6.3 If a team member (Evaluator) does not agree with portions of the evaluation, he/she may submit a written statement indicating areas of disagreement which will be attached to the evaluation report.

Lincoln Land Community College, IL (IL023.TXT)

B. Peer Evaluations

A probationary faculty member may, during any academic year, solicit three confidential peer evaluations. The peer evaluations shall be sought from tenured faculty members mutually agreed upon by the probationary faculty member and the appropriate Department Chair or designee. The participation of tenured faculty in peer evaluations shall be voluntary. Peer evaluations shall be sent to the Vice President, Academic Services not later than 90 days prior to the end of the academic year. Copies of such evaluations may be sent to the Chair of the Board of Trustees and the President as any peer evaluator may elect. Peer evaluations shall be destroyed within 30 days after tenure is granted. If tenure is denied, the peer evaluations shall be retained for at least two years from the date of such denial. Probationary faculty members may review confidential peer evaluations only in the event tenure is denied.

B. Peer Evaluations

A tenured faculty member may, during any academic year, solicit up to three confidential peer evaluations. The peer evaluations shall be sought from tenured faculty members mutually agreed upon by the tenured faculty member and the appropriate Academic Dean. The participation of tenured faculty in peer evaluations shall be voluntary. Peer evaluations shall be sent to the Vice President, Academic Services not later than 90 days prior to the end of the academic year.

E. Response

A tenured faculty member may submit a written response to any evaluation to the Vice President, Academic Services, who shall keep such response with the original evaluation. The acceptance of a response from a tenured faculty member without further comment or action by the Board shall not imply or create any presumption that the Board agrees with the contents of the faculty member's response.

Section 9.6. Evaluations Generally. Only the Board shall have the right to establish or revise the criteria, standards and the procedure to be used for the evaluation and assessment of all faculty members, except as limited by the written provisions of this Article. In addition to the evaluation procedure as set forth in this Agreement, the Board may at any time otherwise assess the performance and qualifications of faculty members for the purpose of making personnel decisions. Only the Board shall have the ability to establish or revise the substantive content, including any judgements therein, of any evaluation of any

faculty member.

Long Beach Community College, CA (CA046.TXT)

E. Evaluation Process for Tenured Unit Members

---

4. The members of the evaluation team must be representative of the diversity of California as required by the Education Code Section 87663 (d).

5. The evaluation team shall consist of the following members.

a. The evaluee (as a nonvoting member).
b. one (1) unit member who has served full-time in the evaluee's department or area of specialization for at least two years, selected by the evaluee. If it is not possible to find a unit member willing to serve, this evaluation team member shall be selected from among unit members who have served full-time in the evaluee's department or area for at least two years, by the time that the evaluation would commence, by a lottery conducted by CCA/LBCC.

c. one (1) unit member who has served full-time in the evaluee's department or area for at least two years, by the time that the evaluation would commence, selected jointly by the department head and the evaluee. If it is not possible to have the members of the evaluation team representative of the diversity of California (see X,E,4) in view of the ethnic or gender composition of the evaluee's department, or if it is not possible for the department head and the evaluee to agree on this team member from inside the evaluee's department or area, the team member shall be selected from outside the evaluee's department in order to increase the ethnic or gender diversity of the evaluation team. This joint appointee shall have the right to decline to serve in this capacity if he/she chooses. If the department head and the evaluee cannot agree on the joint peer, or if it is not possible to find a unit member willing to serve in this capacity, and if the composition of the evaluation team is diverse (see Education Code Section 87663(d), this evaluation team member shall be selected by a lottery conducted by CCA/LBCC, of the faculty members in the evaluee's department or area who have served full-time in the department or area for at least two years by the time that the evaluation would commence. If it is necessary that this evaluation team member bring diversity to the evaluation team,
he/she shall be appointed from the evaluee's department or area, or if that is not possible, from outside the department or area but from a related discipline whenever possible, by the CCA President.

d. Any unit member who serves on more than one evaluation or reevaluation team during the academic year for purposes of achieving diversity (the goal set forth in Education Code 87663 (d)) shall receive hourly pay at his/her regular hourly rate after establishing that he/she has put in or is putting in his/her college service hours through a written statement which is subject to joint verification by the appropriate Vice President or his/her designee and by the CCA president.

e. The department head shall serve as chair of the evaluation team. In the case of a department head's evaluation as a faculty member, the immediate line administrator shall serve as chair.

6. The list of faculty members to be evaluated shall be provided by the Executive Dean, Human Resources to the department heads by September 15 of each year in order to initiate the evaluation process. By November 1 of each year the department head shall submit to the Executive Dean, Human Resources and the instructional dean the list of the evaluation team members for each probationary and tenured unit member to be evaluated that year. (See Article X.C. for procedures for the evaluation of probationary faculty members.) If a tenured faculty member scheduled to be evaluated has not selected the evaluation team member from his/her department or area of specialization by that time, the department head shall appoint a faculty member from the department or area of specialization to fill that position.

7. No member of the evaluation team shall be a close relative of the evaluee as defined in Board Policy 2800.2 (spouse, son, son-in-law, daughter, daughter-in-law, mother, mother-in-law, father, father-in-law, brother, brother-in-law, sister, sister-in-law, grandmother, grandmother-in-law, grandfather, grandfather-in-law, grandchild of the employee, or any person living in the immediate household of the employee).

When the department head is a close relative (as defined in X.E.7.) of the evaluee, the appropriate instructional dean or dean of counseling and student support services shall convene a team composed of:

a. The evaluee (as a nonvoting member).

b. one (I) tenured unit member selected by the evaluee from his/her department or area of specialization.

c. Two (2) tenured unit members from the evaluee's department or area of specialization selected jointly by the evaluee and the appropriate instructional dean or student services dean, or, if necessary to reach agreement, appointed by the appropriate vice president.

d. A department head selected by the appropriate

instructional dean or dean of counseling and student support services from the evaluee's division shall serve as chair (as a nonvoting member).

8. All members of the evaluation team, including the evaluee, must attend an affirmative action briefing conducted by the Affirmative Action officer or designee from the Academic Senate Staff Diversity Committee some time during the year in which the evaluation is held and prior to starting the evaluation. The purpose of this briefing is to ensure that the members of the evaluation team are sensitive to the affirmative action concerns inherent in the evaluation process. No unit member shall be required to attend more than one such affirmative action briefing during a fiscal year.

9. Duties of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation team is the initial body responsible for conducting the basic evaluation of the unit member. The evaluation team shall:

a. Review the "Professional Standards" (listed in X.C.) and processes established for the evaluation process.

b. Review the performance of the unit member's assignment.

c. Determine the responsibilities of the individual team members.

d. Follow the basic time line established by the Human Resources Office for completing the evaluation process.

10. During the course of the evaluation process, the evaluation team shall meet as often as the members decide by majority vote to be necessary.

11. All meetings of the evaluation team shall include the evaluee.

12. The evaluee shall, on request or if he/she desires, submit to the evaluation team information of a professional nature regarding his/her performance. Other members of the evaluation team may also submit such information.

13. The members of the evaluation team other than the evaluee shall rate the evaluee according to the professional standards listed in section X.C.

14. Each member of the evaluation team other than the evaluee shall individually prepare a preliminary evaluation report and submit it to the team chair for use in the preparation of the final evaluation report. Copies of these preliminary reports shall be given to the evaluee as soon as they are received by the team chair. The evaluee shall prepare the "Evaluee Report to the Evaluation Team." A rating of

"Satisfactory" shall not be given unless the evaluee presents a listing of activities for college service hours and in the case of teaching faculty, evidence that written/critical thinking and/or demonstration/critical thinking assignments are required, as set forth in the course outline. In addition, examples of his/her course syllabus and curriculum review activities must be provided, and the evaluee must certify the completion of the student evaluation as provided in Section H. If the evaluee believes, on the basis of his/her preliminary evaluation, that he/she may receive a needs to improve or an unsatisfactory evaluation, he/she may have a CCA representative present at any evaluation team meetings concerning his/her current evaluation or reevaluation if he/she chooses. The role of the CCA representative shall be limited to ensuring that the procedures regarding the evaluation process outlined in this agreement be followed, and that due process be awarded the evaluee. "Unsatisfactory" and "Needs to Improve" ratings require written substantiation.

a. The members of the evaluation team shall rate the evaluee on a three point rating scale:

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs to Improve
3. Satisfactory

b. Individual evaluations shall be completed in ink, signed and dated; no erasures shall be permitted.

c. The evaluee shall be given ten (10) working days to respond in writing to each evaluation team member's evaluation if that evaluation is "Needs to Improve" or "Unsatisfactory." The evaluee's response shall then be discussed by the committee and included with the final evaluation report.

15. The chair will then tally the vote, dividing the total number of points by the number of evaluation team members (excluding the evaluee).

Overall rating scale

1.00-1.49 Unsatisfactory
1.50-2.49 Needs to Improve
2.50-3.00 Satisfactory

16. All decisions, evaluation reports, and recommendations by the evaluation team shall be determined by majority vote and signed immediately by all members who are in agreement. Any minority report and recommendations shall be signed at the same time. Any minority report shall be appended to the evaluation form when submitted to the appropriate instructional dean or dean of counseling and student support services. The minority report will remain in the unit member's file until the next regular evaluation. Immediately prior to the next evaluation, the minority report will be removed from the unit member's permanent

records and destroyed.

17. When the evaluee is given a "Satisfactory" rating, all the materials used by the evaluation team (or by the reevaluation team) shall be forwarded together with the final evaluation report to the appropriate instructional dean or student services dean in a timely manner to meet the deadlines imposed by this agreement. That dean shall (1) forward the final evaluation report to the Executive Dean, Human Resources by the due dates established by this agreement and (2) return all other materials to the evaluee.

18. Copies of all evaluation materials, documentation, reports, and recommendations that are forwarded to the Executive Dean, Human Resources, shall be given to the evaluee.

19. In case of an "Unsatisfactory" rating on the final evaluation report, all evaluation materials, documentation, reports, and recommendations shall be submitted by the evaluation team chair to the appropriate student services dean or appropriate instructional dean who shall submit them to appropriate vice president, who, in turn, shall forward them to the Executive Dean, Human Resources. The evaluation shall then proceed according to E.22.

20. When a unit member receives a "Needs-to-Improve" evaluation, he/she shall prepare a plan for improvement and submit it to the evaluation team. The plan must have identifiable objectives and include the timelines within which each objective is to be achieved. The plan will be appended to the final evaluation report and will be used as part of the next regular evaluation of the unit member. Determination by the evaluation team, by majority vote, that the improvement plan has not been satisfactorily implemented within the established timelines shall be grounds for an unsatisfactory evaluation. If a unit member receives a "Needs to Improve" evaluation, he/she may have a CCA representative present at any future evaluation team meetings concerning his/her current or next regular evaluation if he/she chooses. The role of this CCA representative shall be limited to ensuring that the procedures regarding the evaluation process outlined in this Agreement are followed and that due process be awarded the evaluee. Unit members who have received a "Needs to Improve" evaluation shall have their next regular evaluation in one year. The evaluation team shall remain the same if at all possible.

21. All instruments of the evaluation concerning the evaluee's performance shall be completed and the evaluation team shall meet at least fifty (50) calendar days before the end of the spring semester to read, discuss, revise as necessary, and sign the Final Evaluation Report prepared by the team chair. All instruments of the evaluation concerning the evaluee's performance shall be completed and handed to the appropriate instructional dean or student services dean no later than April

15. In the case of the Vocational Nursing Department, all evaluation instruments shall be submitted to the program director, who shall then submit them to the instructional dean.

If the evaluation team does not meet the deadlines in the paragraph above, the appropriate instructional dean or student services dean shall convene the evaluation team. The evaluation process must be completed before May 15th. This dean shall not participate in the evaluation itself.

22. If a majority of the evaluation team agrees upon a final rating of "Unsatisfactory" at the conclusion of the evaluation process, the Executive Dean, Human Resources, shall refer the evaluee immediately to a Board of Review.

F. Board of Review for Tenured Unit Members

1. The Board of Review shall be composed of the appropriate vice president or designee and one other academic administrator selected by the appropriate vice president, the CCA/LBCC President or designee, and a member of the evaluee's department selected by the CCA/LBCC President. If the department is too small for this to be possible, the CCA President shall appoint a unit member from a closely related discipline to serve in this capacity. The Board of Review shall be chaired by a fifth party acceptable to the other four. No member of the Board of Review shall have served on the evaluation team or tenure review committee that submitted the evaluation in question.

2. The Board of Review has the responsibility to review the evaluation process. It shall determine whether the evaluation or re-evaluation processes were conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in this article and under appropriate provisions of the Education Code and whether due process was exercised by the evaluation or re-evaluation teams. The Board of Review shall meet as often as the members decide by majority vote to be necessary. Meetings of the Board of Review shall be held at times when all participants can be present. If meetings cannot be scheduled without conflicting with the class assignments of the Board of Review members or the evaluee, classroom substitutes shall be provided by the District. The evaluee shall be present at all meeting of the Board of Review unless he/she declines to do so. If the evaluee declines to attend one or more meetings of the Board of Review, he/she shall sign a statement indicating that he/she was afforded the opportunity to be present but declined. All decisions made by the Board of Review shall be determined by majority vote of the members of the Board of Review and signed immediately by all members who are in agreement. Any minority reports shall be signed at the same time.

3. The findings of the Board of Review shall be submitted to the Executive Dean, Human Resources, within five

(5) working days of the last meeting of the Board of Review.

a. If the Board of Review finds that the evaluation or reevaluation was not conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in this Article or in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Education Code, or if the Board of Review finds that due process was not exercised by the evaluation or re-evaluation teams, one of the following shall occur:

1) In the case of a tenured unit member, the evaluation or re evaluation shall be declared invalid and the evaluee shall be evaluated or re-evaluated in the academic year following the academic year in which the Board of Review made its finding.

2) In the case of a probationary unit member, the evaluation shall be declared to be "Satisfactory."

b . If the Board of Review finds that the evaluation or reevaluation was conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in this Article and in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Education Code, and that due process was exercised by the evaluation or re evaluation teams, one of the following shall occur:

1) In the case of the evaluation of a tenured unit member, are evaluation shall be conducted the following semester.

2) In the case of a re-evaluation of a tenured unit member the Executive Dean, Human Resources, shall forward all findings, recommendations, statements, and reports prepared by the evaluation team the reevaluation team, the Board of Review, and the evaluee to the Superintendent President. Copies of these materials shall be given to the evaluee immediately and copies shall be retained in the files of the Human Resources Office until the final disposition of the case.

4. The Superintendent-President shall determine whether to forward a recommendation for action to the Board.

5. If a dismissal hearing is held, the Executive Dean, Human Resources, agrees to notify the CCA-LBCC President of the date, time and place of the hearing, by telephone, confirmed in writing, at least five (5) calendar days in advance of the hearing.

6. Upon the final disposition of the case, all findings, recommendations, statements, and reports and all copies of such held by the evaluation team, re-evaluation team and the Board of Review shall be forwarded to the Executive Dean, Human Resources, who shall seal them and mark them for destruction on a date four (4) years from the date on which they are received in the Human Resources Office.

G . Process in the Case of an Unsatisfactory Rating of a

Tenured Unit Member

1. Whenever the evaluation team reports an "Unsatisfactory" rating, and the Board of Review has found that the evaluation was conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in this article and the appropriate provisions of the Education Code, and that due process was exercised by the evaluation team, the re-evaluation process shall be implemented. The purpose of the re-evaluation process is to assist the evaluee in developing and implementing a plan for improvement in the area or areas of deficiency noted by the evaluation team, to assist the unit member to make improvements, and to evaluate the evaluee's performance under the plan. This process requires the formation of a reevaluation team.

2. The reevaluation team is an augmented evaluation team, chaired by the appropriate instructional dean or student services dean. In order to form this team there will be immediate selection of two (2) additional tenured unit members from the evaluee's department or area of specialization to serve as advisors to the evaluee. One (1) of the advisors shall be selected by the evaluee and the other by his/her department head. The two (2) advisors shall be added as voting members to the original evaluation team for the re evaluation process. The reevaluation team shall meet as often as the members decide by majority vote to be necessary. All meetings of the re evaluation team shall include the evaluee.

3. The evaluee shall develop and submit an improvement plan to the re evaluation team by the end of the semester in which the evaluation occurs.

4. Implementation of the improvement plan will occur during the semester following evaluation. The evaluee shall, on request, submit to the re evaluation team information of a professional nature regarding his/her performance.

5. Reevaluation of the evaluee's performance after implementation of the plan shall be completed in accordance with the time line established by the Human Resources Office following the unsatisfactory rating. Any evidence that could lead to an "Unsatisfactory" rating of the evaluee by the reevaluation team shall be submitted in writing by the reevaluation team members. Such evidence, in order to be considered in the final evaluation report, shall be evaluated in accordance with the standards and processes established herein.

6. Each member of the reevaluation team, with the exception of the evaluee, shall individually prepare a preliminary evaluation report form and submit it to the team chair for use in the preparation of the final evaluation record. All decisions, evaluation reports, and recommendations by the reevaluation
team shall be determined by majority vote and signed immediately

by all members who are in agreement. Any minority reports and recommendations shall be signed at the same time.

7. When a majority of the reevaluation team agrees upon a final rating of unsatisfactory at the conclusion of the reevaluation process, each member of the team with the exception of the evaluee shall append to his/her preliminary evaluation report a signed written statement giving the reasons and supporting evidence for the ratings assigned. The reevaluation team chair shall consider and evaluate these preliminary reports and statements together with all other documentation collected in the evaluation process when preparing the final evaluation report and recommendations.

8. All preliminary reports, written statements, majority and minority reports and team recommendations shall be appended to the final evaluation report. The evaluee shall receive copies of these materials at the time that the final evaluation report is signed. The final evaluation report and all materials appended to it shall be forwarded by the reevaluation team chair to the Executive Dean, Human Resources. The evaluee shall be given a period of ten (10) working days in which to submit a response to the Executive Dean, Human Resources.

9. At the end of the ten (10) day period allowed for the evaluee's response in Section G.8. of this Article, the Executive Dean, Human Resources, shall refer the evaluee to a Board of Review.

10. When an evaluee has been referred to a Board of Review, a meeting shall be held between the Executive Dean, Human Resources, and the appropriate CCA-LBCC representatives to discuss the protections provided under the law in the evaluation process.

I. This Article is not subject to the Grievance Procedure as outlined in Article V.

Los Angeles Community College System, CA (CA025.TXT)

ARTICLE 19, EVALUATION
PART ONE - EVALUATION OTHER THAN CONTRACT FACULTY

G.Evaluation Forms
The following evaluation forms shall be provided by the Office of Personnel Operations and used in the evaluation process (Appendix B).

1.Instructor Peer Evaluation Form
2.Counselor Peer Evaluation Form
3.Librarian Peer Evaluation Form
4.Nurse Peer Evaluation Form
5.Handicap Specialist Peer Evaluation Form
6.Instructor Special Assignment/Consulting Instructor Peer Evaluation Form
7.Child Development Center Teacher Peer Evaluation Form
8.Performance Report Form for Peer Evaluation
9.Performance Report Form for Administrative Evaluation
10. Performance Report on Department Chair/Director CDC
11. Student Evaluation of Instructor Form
12. Student Evaluation of Counselor Form

By mutual agreement of the parties, any and all evaluation forms may be changed.

H.Performance Evaluation of Faculty Unit Employees

7.Procedure for Evaluation of Faculty Members

a.Peer Evaluation Committee

(1)The Peer Evaluation Committee shall be a three-person committee with the Department Chair as the Chair, one department member chosen by the Department, and one department member chosen by the evaluee. The appropriate Vice President or his/her designee shall be an ex-officio non-voting member. If the Department Chair is the evaluee, his/her committee shall consist of two members of the department selected by the department, one of whom shall serve as committee chair based on District seniority, and one department member selected by the evaluee. Where there are not sufficient department members to serve on a committee, related disciplines may be used to furnish committee members. All committee members shall be regular employees.

(2)During the meeting indicated in (4) (c) below, the evaluee has the option to challenge any one member of the committee and a replacement will be elected by the department. If the Department Chair is challenged, that person elected by the department shall serve as Committee Chair.

(3)The Committee Chair shall chair the Peer Evaluation Committee and shall schedule the evaluation procedure so that the Peer Performance Report is completed at least three weeks before the Report must be sent to the District Office.

(4)The Evaluation Committee shall operate as follows:

(a)Strict confidentiality shall be maintained.

(b)The committee shall consider input from the appropriate Vice

President or his/her designee and the Chair as well as from others the committee feels would have direct information about the competence of the evaluee. The Evaluation Committee Chair shall notify the evaluee not less than five (5) days prior to the beginning of an evaluation.

(c)The Evaluation Committee Chair shall meet with the evaluee at the beginning of the process and the committee shall meet with the evaluee when the evaluation information is in, if the evaluee desires such a meeting, to discuss the various items. The evaluee shall have complete access to all information given the committee. Information that is of a hearsay or unsubstantiated nature shall be disregarded.

(d)Each committee member shall, after prior notice, visit one or more classes conducted by the evaluee.

(g)The Peer Evaluation Committee shall meet and make a finding of "Satisfactory", "Needs to Improve", or Unsatisfactory" and complete the Peer Performance Report.

---

b.Disposition of Forms; Conditions for Administrative Evaluation

If the Peer Performance Report indicates an overall evaluation of "Satisfactory", Student Evaluations shall be returned to the evaluee and Peer Evaluation Forms shall be destroyed by the Chair in the presence of the evaluee. The Performance Reports shall be forwarded by the Chair to the appropriate Vice President for signature of receipt. If the overall evaluation is marked other than "Satisfactory", all evaluation forms and information shall be forwarded to the appropriate Vice President for an Administrative Evaluation.

---

d.When a "Needs to Improve" or "Unsatisfactory" has been indicated on the Peer Evaluation Form and the Administrative Evaluation Form and communicated to the evaluee, it shall be the immediate responsibility of the Department Chair involved and the appropriate Vice President to work with the evaluee in a positive way to encourage improvement. The techniques involved shall include consultation and may include class visitations, use of media for self-evaluation, literature review and arranging for updating of background, all with the purpose of helping the evaluee improve.

8.Review of Performance Report

a.The completed Peer Evaluation Report and, if applicable, Administrative Performance Report shall be given by the appropriate Vice President to the employee being evaluated at a meeting scheduled to discuss the performance report.

b.The Committee Chair shall attend the meeting indicated in item a. above.

c.The meeting indicated in item a. above shall be completed prior to the deadline for submission of the Performance Report to the Division of Human Resources.

d.If the employee being evaluated is not able to attend the review meeting, a copy of the Performance Report will be sent to him or her.

9.All forms used in the evaluation procedure shall be completed in accordance with the instructions on the form.

10.The completed Peer Performance Report and, if applicable, Administrative Performance Report must be stapled together and submitted to the Division of Human Resources for filing in the employee's personnel folder prior to the established deadline.

I.Additional Evaluation

1.If the District intends to dismiss or penalize a faculty member for "Unprofessional Conduct" or "Incompetency" under the grounds set forth in Education Code Section 87732, an additional evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with this Article.

Mt. San Antonio Community College District, CA (CA006.TXT)

ARTICLE XIII

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

---

9. Peer Faculty are those with whom one works on a continuing basis.

Evaluation of Regular Faculty

Faculty evaluation is the responsibility of a team of persons, including the faculty member, administrators, department chairpersons, and peers.

In order to evaluate the performance expectancies, all evaluators shall have the opportunity for classroom or other appropriate visitations.
Visitations may be arranged in advance at the request of the regular faculty member. Each member of the regular faculty shall

be evaluated not less than once every two (2) years.

---

2. Peer Evaluation: The department chairperson, or in absence thereof, the immediate administrator, assumes a coordinating role for the peer evaluation team. Participants include:

a. The faculty member being evaluated.

b. The department chairperson, or in absence thereof, a faculty member from this area.

c. A member of the department chosen by mutual consent of the faculty member and the chairperson. This person shall not be a member of the same evaluation team for more than two (2) evaluations in succession, if possible, and should be appointed as soon as possible after the preceding evaluation.

d. At the option of the faculty member, a fourth person may be chosen by him /her. This person must be from the same department or an administrator who is competent in the faculty member's discipline.

As soon as the evaluation team is formed, a preliminary meeting should be held at which time evaluation procedures may be agreed upon. At this time, the goals and objectives of the person being evaluated shall be presented in writing for discussion. However, rules for the procedures to be followed are not formalized and will vary from department to department. Not less than each alternate year a conference shall be held at which time the faculty member shall provide information he/she has gathered in his/her own self-analysis, and members of the peer evaluation team shall provide the information which they have gathered as a result of their own observations. It is the peer group's responsibility to ascertain the adequacy of the self-evaluation procedures. At this time, a single report shall be prepared summarizing the results of the peer evaluation process to be signed by all persons concerned. The faculty member may add his/her won separate comment to this report. The peer evaluation report shall cover at least items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of Section B of this Article. The report shall also include the faculty member's stated goals and objectives for his/her subsequent performance prior to his/her next formal evaluation.

- 37

One of the signed copies shall be forwarded to the division dean or immediate administrator, no later than February 15, and the other is to be retained by the faculty member.

---

4. Repetition of Evaluation

If the faculty member is rated "unsatisfactory" by either his/her peers or the administrative evaluator in any category specified

in Section B of this Article, the evaluation procedures shall be repeated annually until satisfactory performance is achieved; however, in those categories, e.g., items 5 and 6, evaluated by both administrative and peer evaluators, agreement as to the unsatisfactory performance of the faculty member is required before the annual repetition of evaluation procedures shall be mandatory.

Appendix H - Evaluation Forms

REGULAR FACULTY EVALUATION REPORT

PEER Evaluation

Name Date

EVALUATION CRITERIA:
Satisfactory
Needs to Improve REMARKS OR SPECIFIC
Unsatisfactory SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

PREPARATION Is thorough in preparation for all class assignments

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH Is involved in increasing expertise in subject and teaching

Techniques develops and utilizes effective pedalogical techniques

COOPERATION (cooperates with all department and colleagues in educational projects

COMPLIANCE WITH COURSE OUTLINE - Teaches in area of competence and in compliance with course outline

RESPONSIBILITY Is honest and fair with a 11 students and colleagues

A check of Needs to Improve or Unsatisfactory in any category must be accompanied by an explanatory remark by the evaluation committee.
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION: Appendix H - Evaluation Forms.

COMMENT BY FACULTY MEMBER (OPTIONAL)

Signature of evaluators:

Signature of Faculty Member:

One copy to Faculty Member One copy to District Personnel File

---

Appendix H - Evaluation Forms LIBRARIAN FACULTY EVALUATION REPORT

Peer Evaluation

Name Date

Evaluation Criteria

Remarks or Specific
Suggestions for Change

PREPARATION Is thorough in preparing and carrying out assigned duties as librarian and as supervisor of classified and student employees.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH Is involved in increasing expertise in librarian- ship.

TECHNIQUES develops and utilizes effective communication techniques in working with students, staff, and other faculty.

COOPERATION cooperates with department and colleagues in planning and implementing library programs.

COMPLIANCE WITH LIBRARY PROCEDURES Follows established library procedures in carrying out assigned responsibilities.

RESPONSIBILITY Involved in the total program of the college, community and student activities.

A check of Needs to Improve or Unsatisfactory in any category must be accompanied by an explanatory comment by the evaluation committee.

85
Summary of evaluation: Appendix H - Evaluation Forms

Comment by librarian faculty member (optional):

Signature of evaluators:

Signature of Librarian

One Copy to Librarian Faculty Member One Copy to District Personnel File

Rio Hondo Community College, CA (CA028.TXT)

ARTICLE 9: EVALUATION PROCEDURES

At Rio Hondo College, evaluation of full-time regular unit members is the primary responsibility of the District. and the evaluation of full-time regular unit members is the primary responsibility of a peer review committee except as provided for herein. Both the District and a peer review committee will evaluate part-time unit members (temporary).

H. Peer Review

A technique for evaluating the quality of performance of faculty, using faculty to evaluate other faculty and to provide for enhancing classroom teaching by giving feedback to one's colleagues.

B. PEER REVIEW

For full-time regular unit members, peer review is the primary method of evaluation. The peer review process is summarized in Matrix B (see attachment entitled "Faculty Evaluation Process: Peer Review").

Committee Selection: The unit member to be evaluated shall select a peer review committee consisting of a minimum of two faculty, one of which must be regular full-time; the other may be a full-time contract faculty or a part-time faculty who has taught three semesters at Rio Hondo. The committee will be mutually agreed upon by the District and the unit member. If mutual consent does not occur, the unit member shall select another committee. In the event that this committee is not mutually agreed upon, another committee made up of two faculty members selected by the unit member and one selected by the District shall be formed.

Process: In the Fall of the evaluation year, the committee shall meet with the unit member to agree upon the components of the review which shall consist of student evaluations which may consist of CAT's, and open-ended surveys at mid-semester and/or semester' s end. These student evaluations may or may not be shared with the committee at the option of the unit member. The evaluation may consist of: a performance observation, teaching portfolio and/or professional growth plan. Should the unit member choose to have a
performance observation, the observers will meet with the unit member within 10 working days to discuss the observation. When the unit member has completed his/her peer review plan (no later than February 28), the committee will reconvene to discuss the results of the plan. Following that meeting the committee will notify Human Resources that the evaluation is satisfactory.

Should the committee not forward a satisfactory, the evaluation shall be considered to be "in progress." At this time, the committee shall meet with the unit member to develop an Academic

Support Plan. The unit member and the committee shall meet before May 15 to decide if the Academic Support Plan has been completed. If the plan is completed, the committee will forward a satisfactory recommendation to the Office of Human Resources.

Should the plan not be completed, the unit member shall be evaluated during the first semester of the following year.

Committee Selection: The unit member to be evaluated shall select a peer review committee consisting of a minimum of two regular full- time faculty. The committee will be mutually agreed upon by the District and the unit member. If mutual consent does not occur, the unit member shall select another committee consisting of a minimum of two regular full-time faculty. In the event that this committee is not mutually agreed upon, another committee made up of two regular full-time faculty members selected by the unit member and one selected by the District shall be formed.

Process: The committee shall meet with the unit member upon the components of the review which shall consist of a performance observation and student evaluations which may consist of CAT's, and open-ended surveys at mid-semester, and/or semester's end. These student evaluations may or may not be shared with the committee at the option of the unit member. The evaluation may consist of: a teaching portfolio and/or a professional growth plan. Following the performance observation, the observers will meet with the unit member within 10 working days to discuss the observation. When the unit member has completed his/her peer review plan (no later than December 15), the committee will reconvene to discuss the results of the evaluation. Following that meeting the committee will notify Human Resources that the evaluation is satisfactory.

Should a satisfactory not be forwarded, the evaluation shall be considered to be "in progress." At this time, the committee shall meet with the instructor to develop an Academic Support Plan. The instructor and the committee shall meet before May 15 to decide if the Academic Support Plan has been completed. If the plan is completed, the committee will forward a satisfactory recommendation to Human Resources.
Should the plan not be completed, administrative review shall be required in accordance with that identified in Part A Section 3. Peer review shall no longer be continued. The District may meet with any or all peer committees involved in the evaluation of the unit member.

4. APPEAL PROCESS

A. Should a unit member disagree with the administrative evaluator's written findings and recommendations, he/she may appeal to the Vice President of Academic Services. The Vice President of Academic Services will review the case and make a decision which will then be reviewed with the unit member and the evaluator within ten (10) school days of receipt of the appeal.

B. Further appeal by the unit member or evaluator may be made to the President of the College whose decision shall be final.

C. During the appeal process, the unit member is entitled to representation by the Faculty Association when meetings involve matters affecting the employment relations status between the unit member and the District.

D. Unit members may pursue alleged violations of the evaluation procedure as specified in this article through the grievance article contained in this Agreement.

San Bernardino Community College, CA (CA052.TXT)

ARTICLE 16 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The District has the right to evaluate and assess the performance of each bargaining unit member.

A. The District also has the sole responsibility to evaluate and assess the performance of each bargaining unit member. Nothing in this Article shall allow a violation of Sections of the Education Code covering the procedures for evaluation of certificated employees in public community college districts in California.

---

3. The formal Evaluation Procedure shall include a peer review process.

a. Qualified peers are members of the certificated staff who are knowledgeable about the subject area taught by the employee undergoing evaluation and experienced in comparable types of teaching situations. In the case of counselors and librarians, qualified peers are members of the Counseling staff or faculty familiar through training or experience with the assignment of the employee undergoing evaluation.

b. For contract and regular employees, two qualified peers shall participate in the employee's evaluation. The two shall consist of one peer to be selected by the Academic Senate and one peer to be selected by the employee being evaluated.

c. For temporary employees, only one peer shall participate in the employee's evaluation. The peer shall be selected by the division chairperson or appropriate supervisor.

d. Peers are responsible for review of the employee on the items specified in 5 a-e below.

e. Peers shall base their review of the employee on at least two of the following procedures.

1. Direct observation of the employee during performance of his/her assigned duties;

2. Interview with the employee regarding his/her performance on the items indicated in 5 a-e below.

3. Observations of the employee in his/her relationships and communications with students, peers and other members of the college community.

f. Each of the two peers shall submit in writing a statement of opinion regarding the employee's performance on the items of evaluation. Unit members shall not be required to participate in more than two peer reviews per year unless the unit member so agrees. A unit member shall not be required to serve as a peer reviewer during any semester when he/she is being evaluated unless the unit member so agrees.

San Diego Community College, CA (CA024.TXT)

ARTICLE XV - EVALUATION OF FACULTY

NOTE: The procedures set forth in this section of this Agreement regarding evaluation and the granting or denial of tenure and/or promotion are intended by the Guild and the District to be applied in such a manner that they will avoid arbitrary and capricious recommendations and decisions.

15.1 TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Peer Evaluation Instruments

15.1.5 The comprehensive evaluation of classroom faculty will utilize the "Faculty Appraisal" instrument and the procedures delineated herein. Counseling faculty instruments and procedures will be re-evaluated after a one (1) year implementation period during the academic year 1991-92. Evaluation instruments for other non-classroom faculty will be developed through the Mutual Gains bargaining process.

Evaluation Coordination

15.1.8 The peer and student evaluation processes shall be a collaborative one, and shall be supervised and coordinated at each College by an Evaluation Coordinator to be mutually agreed

upon by the College President and the Guild. The Faculty Evaluation Coordinator at each campus, if a faculty member, shall receive a minimum of 20% (twenty percent) reassigned time.

15.1.9 Evaluation Committee - Composition and General Rules

(1) Faculty Evaluation Committees shall be comprised of the appropriate Dean, Associate Dean, or other appropriate administrator, the Department Chair or his/her designee, and one (1) or two (2) peer evaluators. Hereafter, all references in this Article to "Dean" shall be understood to include "School Dean," "Associate Dean," and/or "other administrator," whichever is most appropriate. All references to "Chair" shall be understood to include "or his/her designee," whenever appropriate.

(2) After meeting with the appropriate Chair and Dean, each new faculty member will recommend to the Dean in writing one (1) or two (2) peers to serve on the evaluation committee along with the Dean and the Department Chair. One (1) of the peer evaluators must be a specialist in the subject area in which the evaluee teaches or is assigned or in a subject area reasonably related to that in which the evaluee teaches or is assigned. All peer evaluators and the Chair serving as an evaluator must be tenured and must hold academic rank superior to that of the probationary faculty member. Under special circumstances (shortages of qualified evaluators), tenured Assistant Professors may evaluate probationary Assistant Professors, and tenured Associate Professors may evaluate probationary Associate Professors.

(3) The first evaluation committee selected for a new faculty member will maintain its original composition throughout the probationary period, unless circumstances make this unworkable as determined by the Dean and Chair.

(4) At the start of each subsequent academic year beyond the awarding of tenure and in which the faculty member is scheduled for evaluation, the faculty member will be asked in writing by his/her Dean to recommend again in writing the names of one (1) or two (2) peer evaluators. All peer evaluators for tenured faculty, and the Chair serving as an evaluator, must be tenured and must hold academic rank superior to that of the tenured evaluee, except in cases of evaluation of full Professors. In such instances, peer evaluators must hold the rank of Professor. If there is a disagreement between the Dean and the faculty member regarding peer selection, the disagreement will be resolved in a timely manner by the College Evaluation Coordinator. The Evaluation Coordinator's resolution shall be in writing and shall be sent to both the Dean and the affected faculty member.

(5) If there are no appropriate faculty within the Department,

the faculty member, probationary or tenured, may suggest to the Dean in writing evaluators from other Departments, other campuses, or, if necessary, from outside the District. In such cases, the outside peer evaluator must be a subject-area specialist or a specialist in a subject area reasonably related to that in which the evaluee teaches or is assigned. It will be the responsibility of each campus Evaluation Coordinator to make the arrangements for external evaluators and to provide training on the evaluation criteria and process.

(6) The subject matter specialist(s) shall have the major role(s) in evaluating the criterion of "Subject Matter Knowledge."

15.1.13 Evaluation Procedures for Tenured Faculty

First Committee Meeting: Instrument Modification

(1) After the evaluation committee has been formed but before any class visits are made in each evaluation year, the entire committee shall meet with the evaluee to discuss the evaluation instrument and process. The committee shall adapt the instrument to the specific circumstances and needs of the discipline and/or situation, deleting inappropriate "examples of performance" and adding others that may be more appropriate. The evaluation instrument, properly amended, then shall be the formal document utilized to conduct the evaluation process. The Committee also shall agree on how the five (5) "areas of performance" listed on the "Faculty Appraisal Summary Sheet" shall be prioritized and weighted; the weighting must be indicated on the "Faculty Appraisal Summary" page of the current "Evaluation Instrument." All of the various evaluation criteria shall be in writing and shall be distributed to all who participate in the process.

Class Visits

(2) In all post-tenure evaluations, each evaluator will be required to make one (1) class or site visit.

Letters of Appraisal

Second Committee Meeting: Data Integration

(4) Once an evaluee's file is complete, the Dean will convene a meeting of the evaluation committee. At that meeting, committee members should agree upon summary ratings and comments and prepare the "Faculty Appraisal Summary" and "Comments and Suggestions" sheets referred to in 15.1.10(2) above.

Development Plans

(5) The Evaluation Committee must complete a "Faculty Evaluation Development Plan" (FEDP) whenever the final rating given to a tenured evaluee on the "Faculty Appraisal Summary Sheet" is less than "Competent."

Any time weaknesses are observed, those weaknesses must be identified specifically and a constructive process must be identified in order to assist faculty to meet expectations. Specific suggestions detailing what a faculty member needs to do to meet expectations must be made in a timely fashion.

When an FEDP is completed by evaluators, the faculty member's progress toward reaching his/her developmental goals will be discussed in a "follow-up" meeting with the evaluation committee. That meeting will be held no earlier than eight (8) months and no later than 12 (twelve) months following the completion of the FEDP.

If after the "follow-up" meeting the evaluation committee agrees that remedial expectations have been met, the FEDP will not become part of the faculty member's official personnel file. If the evaluation committee decides that remedial expectations have not been met, the FEDP and a one(1)-year "follow-up" report will become part of the faculty member's official personnel file, and he/she will be notified of such in a timely manner.

The failure to meet remedial expectations by the time of the one(1)-year "follow-up" report and the entering of that information in the faculty member's official personnel file shall be considered as an "unsatisfactory" evaluation. An unsatisfactory evaluation will result in the faculty member's salary being "frozen" at his/her current step, under the terms of Article VIII, Section A4.2 above. As soon as remedial suggestions have been met (as certified by the appropriate Evaluation Committee), the faculty member will begin again to advance in step, effective the first day of the next pay period. N.B. "Faculty Development Plans" shall be used for tenured faculty ONLY.

Third Committee Meeting: Review and Summary

(6) The Dean then will convene a third meeting of the evaluation committee and the evaluee. Prior to that meeting, the evaluee will have the opportunity to inspect the file. If the evaluee then wishes to respond to anything that is in the file, he/she shall be granted a reasonable amount of time (up to ten [10] working days) to do so. The response(s) will be included in the file.

Promotional Recommendations and Administrative Review

(7) After the completion of the third evaluation committee meeting and the resolution of all matters pursuant to it, the Dean will notify the Vice President or the Dean of Instruction/Students of the evaluation committee's recommendations. Such notification shall be in writing.

San Joaquin Delta Community College District, CA (CA005.TXT)

ARTICLE XVI

EVALUATION OF FACULTY

B. Peer Review

1. All faculty will be given a peer review the same yea r as their regular administrative evaluation.

2. The peer review process will be a review in the "formative" style. All persons involved in this process need to be especially sensitive to the cultural, ethnic and gender diversity of the college staff.

(a) The peer reviewer(s) will be selected according to procedures established by a committee within each division.

(b) A faculty member may refuse to serve as a peer reviewer, but in the event all faculty refuse, the Division Chairperson will appoint one or more reviewers (as necessary) and these appointments may not be refused.

(c) If more than two reviews are to be done by a reviewer in any academic year, the reviewer will be compensated at a rate equal to their hourly rate on the hourly salary schedule for two hours of pay for each person reviewed. This will be in addition to any other hourly assignment. The Division Chairperson shall approve peer reviews in excess of two.

(d) Peer review is to be comprehensive of all the faculty member's responsibilities and not pertain to just course review.

(e) No peer reviews will be done for part-time faculty members.

3. The Process for Peer Review

(a) The review should include:

1. A pre-review conference between the faculty member to be reviewed and the reviewer.

2. A review of course handouts, in particular the stated course objectives.

3. A review of use of instructional materials, if any.

4. A review of use of equipment, if any.

5. A review of student grade determination procedures.

6. A review of other professional work including but not limited to committees, Academic Senate, professional organization, curriculum and course development, review of relationships with students, and work with advisory groups.

7. A post-review discussion, at which time the reviewer will give the reviewed person written suggestions as to how the reviewed person's performance may be improved, if needed. Also, positive comments should be included.

(b) Classroom visitations, except for librarians, will be made if an administrative classroom visitation is to be done. Time and day will be agreed upon at the pre-review conference.

(c) In the case of counselors, the peer review should include:

1. A pre-review conference.

2. A review of instructional competence (Guidance courses), if applicable, and a classroom visitation in which the time and day will be agreed upon at the pre-review conference.

3. A review of the relationship with students, including empathy, rapport, and enabling atmosphere.

4. A review of knowledge of SJDC graduation and certificate requirements.

5. A review of knowledge of transfer requirements and agreements.

6. A review of knowledge of the field (conference attendance, etc.).

7. A review of other professional work including but not limited to committees, Academic Senate, professional organizations, curriculum and course development, review of relationships with students, and work with advisory groups.

8. A post-review discussion, at which time the reviewer will give the reviewed person written suggestions as to how the reviewed person's performance may be improved, if needed. Also, positive comments should be included.

(d) In the case of librarians, the peer review should include:

1. A pre-review conference.

2. A review of relationship with students and faculty.

3. A review of reference competence.

4. A review of specialty area competence.

5. A review of other professional work including but not limited to committees, Academic Senate, professional organizations, curriculum and course development, review of relationships with students, and work with advisory groups.

6. A post-review discussion, at which time the reviewer will give the reviewed person written suggestions as to how the reviewed person's performance may be improved, if needed. Also, positive comments should be included.

(e) A form signed by both the person reviewed and the reviewer will be sent to the Division Chairperson by the reviewer verifying that the review has been completed. The form will be called the Peer Review Verification form and will become part of the faculty member's confidential file as a result of the peer review process.

1. In the case of teaching staff, the form will list the course or courses reviewed and the dates of review. The form will certify that the student and the self evaluation were also completed.

2. In the case of counselors and librarians, the form will list the course or courses reviewed (if any) and the dates of the review. The form will certify that a self evaluation and student evaluation (where applicable) were also completed. The form to be used is contained in Appendix F.

C. Student Evaluation

A student evaluation will be conducted for all faculty in conjunction with the peer review, and shall be coordinated by the peer reviewer. The peer reviewer and the faculty member shall certify to the Division Chair that the evaluation was completed. The form to be used is contained in Appendix F.

D. Self Evaluation

In conjunction with the peer review, a self-evaluation will be done by all faculty. This evaluation shall be shared with the peer reviewer but shall not be given to any other person, or placed in any file. The form to be used is contained in Appendix F.

ARTICLE 5.0: EVALUATION POLICY

Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College, CA (CA018.TXT)

5.7 Peer Evaluations for Permanent. Tenured Bargaining Unit Members

The primary function of peer evaluation is to maintain a high level of professional competence and to improve the educational process. All teaching members of each division will be evaluated once every three years.

5.7.1 Selection of Peer Evaluators:

5.7.1.1 Faculty evaluators will be selected by the person to be evaluated.

5.7.1.2 An evaluator must be a tenured full-time member of the Shasta College faculty from the member's division.

5.7.1.3 An evaluator may elect to do no more than two evaluations per semester.

5.7.1.4 All peer reviewers shall have completed a District sponsored in-service training session specifically designed for evaluators and developed in concert with the Senate.

5.7.2 Peer teaching evaluation will include a pre-observation discussion, classroom observation, and a post-observation discussion between evaluator and evaluatee. An evaluation form will be used for recording observations of classroom instruction. The post-observation discussion will include review of the classroom observations; use of materials and equipment; a review of stated course objectives and measuring devices; strengths and weaknesses of the instructors; and other matters that are deemed relevant to the evaluation process and the improvement of instruction.

5.7.3 The instructor will be observed in at least one class; if the instructor is a member of more than one division, he or she will choose the division. Choice of classes in which observations are to be made will be by mutual agreement between peer evaluator and

instructor.

5.7.4 Peer evaluators should review the entire Evaluation Policy relating to instructors.

5.7.5 A form signed by both parties shall be returned to the division director verifying that the peer teaching evaluation has been completed. It will include the date of the evaluation and class or classes in which observation occurred; it will not contain the substance of the evaluation. The verification will become part of the bargaining unit member's evaluation file. All copies of the peer classroom observation form shall be given to the evaluated instructor.

The peer evaluator may suggest further evaluation by the appropriate administrator.

5.9.7 Appeal to Arbitration

Evaluation procedures may be subject to the grievance procedure in accordance with Article 10. The content of evaluations is not subject to the grievance procedure set forth in Article 10.

Sonoma County Junior College District, CA (CA079.TXT)

Article 14a: Evaluation -- Regular Faculty

14a.1 INTRODUCTION

A. This evaluation process is based on a three year cycle. Here are two main components:

1. Self-conducted student evaluation in Years 1 and 2, and

2. Team Evaluation in Year 3.

H . The Team Evaluation shall serve the intent of AB 1725: "A faculty member's students, administrators and peers should all contribute to his or her evaluation, but the faculty should, in the usual case, play a central role in the evaluation process and, together with appropriate administrator assume principal responsibility for the effectiveness of the process" (Section 4: v: 5).

14a.4 TEAM EVALUATION: YEAR 3

A. "Evaluations shall include, but not be limited to, a peer review process. The peer review process shall be on a departmental or divisional basis, and shall address the forthcoming demographics of California, and the principles of affirmative action. The process shall require that the peers reviewing are both representative of the diversity of California and sensitive to affirmative action concerns, all without compromising quality and excellence in teaching" (Ed Code 887663c and d).

B . The Team Evaluation shall serve the intent of AB 1725: "A faculty member's students, administrators, and peers should all contribute to his or her evaluation, but the faculty should, in the usual case, play a central role in the evaluation process and, together with appropriate administrator assume principal responsibility for the effectiveness of the process" (Section 4: v: 5).

C . By the end of the second week of the Fall semester, the District shall notify each faculty member being evaluated and each Department Chair (or Program Director if there is no Department Chair) of the Team Evaluations scheduled for that year.

1. If a faculty member has applied for retirement, the team evaluation will still be completed.

2. If a faculty member scheduled for team evaluation is on leave for all or part of the year, the Team Evaluation will be conducted in the following year.

D. The Evaluation Team for each regular faculty member consists of the following: Department Chair, Discipline Peer, Additional Peer, and ex-officio Instructional Dean. The Department Chair or Program Director is responsible for designating the members of each Evaluation Team.

1. Department Chair: The elected faculty Chair of the department. In departments without Department Chairs, the Director of the program shall serve in this capacity.

A. The Department Chair shall identify the Discipline Peer from the department's established rotation list and shall call the first Evaluation Team meeting.

B. The Department Chair is primarily responsible for reporting on the faculty member's fulfillment of College Service, and Professional Service and Development responsibilities, as defined by the job description, and may comment on Student Contact responsibilities.

C .If the Department Chair is the evaluee, his/her committee shall consist of two Discipline Peers, one designated by the appropriate Administrator to serve in the role of Department

Chair.

2. Discipline Peer: A regular or adjunct faculty member serving according to a rotation list established within the department.

A. The Discipline Peer serves as Chair of che Evaluation Team.

B. The Discipline Peer is primarily responsible for reporting on the faculty member's performance in Student Contact and may comment on Professional Service and Development.

C. The evaluee has the option to challenge one Discipline Peer appointment of the committee and a replacement will be made from the department rotation list.

D. NOTE*: Adjunct faculty serving as Discipline Peer as part of the Department rotation list shall receive compensation for their time at the District Activity rate as part of the College Activities Hours Budget.

3. Additional Peer: A regular or adjunct faculty member chosen by the evaluee. When appropriate, this member could be from another department. The Additional Peer shall be seated on the Evaluation Team only upon mutual agreement of the Department Chair, the Discipline Peer, and the evaluee.

A. The Additional Peer is primarily responsible for reporting on the faculty member's performance in Student Contact and may comment on Professional Service and Development.

B. NOTE*: Adjunct faculty serving as Additional Peer shall receive compensation for their time at the District Activity rate.

4. Administrator: The Dean, Associate Dean or Assistant Dean to which the Department or program reports.

A. An ex-officio, non-voting position, the Administrator is available to the team and to the evaluee for consultation.

B. The Administrator may be asked by either the team or the evaluee to observe a student contact activity and/or participate in team discussions. c .The evaluee must be informed in writing of the participation of the Administrator.

E. The faculty member being evaluated shall submit to the Evaluation Team Chair by the end of the fourth week of the fall semester the following materials. Self Assessment materials from years one and two which includes dime required sections and an optional fourth section

1.Student Contact (required): the required Student Evaluation Summary and Response from years 1 and 2 and any additional

student evaluation materials from years 1 and 2.

2. College Service (required): summary of the activities undertaken in fulfillment of College Service as outlined in the Job Description for years I and 2 of the evaluation cycle.

3. Professional Service and Development (required): summary of the activities undertaken in fulfillment of Professional Development and Professional Service as outlined in the Job Description for years 1 and 2 of the evaluation cycle.

4. Faculty Statement (optionally): statement may include any or all of the following:

A. a statement of teaching philosophy;

B. identification of strengths and areas for improvement to which the faculty member would like to pay particular attention during this evaluation process;

C. current curriculum vitae; and

D. identification of specific professional development goals.

E. A teaching or allied schedule, and current syllabi, if applicable

f. The faculty member may also forward other relevant material for Team review, such as sample assignments, copies of publications, certificates of in-service completion, etc.

F .The Evaluation Team will meet by the end of the sixth week of the fall semester to establish a calendar of activities for the year. At that time the Evaluation Team will review the Faculty Portfolio and additional information submitted by the faculty member for review. A complete Faculty Portfolio at this time includes:

1. Self Assessment materials as described in paragraph IV E above

2. A teaching or allied schedule, and current syllabi, if applicable, which will NOT be included in the permanent Faculty Portfolio

3 .Other material submitted by the faculty member (such as sample assignments, copies of publications, certificates of in-service completion, etc.), which will NOT be included in the permanent Faculty Portfolio.

G .The Evaluation Team, in consultation with the evaluee, establishes a plan for student contact observations, by the end of the sixth week of the Fall semester.

H .The Discipline Peer and Additional Peer are each required to observe at least one student contact activity during the evaluation year (after prior notification and consent of faculty member). The Department Chair is encouraged, but not required to observe an activity. Each team member making a student contact observation must then complete an Observation Report. The team should try to visit different activities, or different versions of the same activity, in order to achieve a broad picture of a faculty member's performance.

I .Each member of the Evaluation Team who conducts a student contact Observation will gather student evaluations using the approved form from students in courses/sections or allied activities observed. These results shall be summarized, prior to March 15, for Team consideration in forming the conclusions and shall be attached to the Final Summary report.

J .The Department Chair shall complete the Department Chair Report, commenting on the faculty member's performance in College Service and Professional Service and Development prior to March 15. For this purpose, the Department Chair may solicit input from faculty peers and others the faculty member interacts with on a regular basis.

K .The Evaluation Team will meet and discuss their evaluation, beginning with review of the complete Faculty Portfolio. At this time a complete Faculty Portfolio includes:

1 .Self Assessment Materials, as described in paragraph IV E above

2. A teaching, or allied schedule, and current syllabi, if applicable, which will NOT be included in the permanent Faculty Portfolio

3. Other material submitted by the faculty member (such as sample assignments, copies of publications, certificates of in-service completion, etc.), which will NOT be included in the permanent Faculty Portfolio

4. Student Contact Evaluations Year Three

5. Student contact activity Observation Reports year three

6. Department Chair Report year three

L. The Evaluation Team must complete a final Summary Report before April I of any year. This Summary Report will include:

1. A Summary Description of performance in all three performance areas and

2. A Summary Evaluation Conclusion.

3. The Summary Description and Summary Evaluation Conclusion must be based on, and reflect, a careful review of the complete Faculty Portfolio, including the materials identified in paragraph IV K above.

4. The Evaluation Team may identify areas for development and/or make recommendations for continued growth as a part of the Summary Report in the Summary Description. M. The Evaluation Team must achieve consensus on their final Summary Evaluation Conclusion. That report must reach one of the following conclusions about the faculty member's overall performance.

1. Excellent: Exceeds most performance criteria and standards

2. Good: Exceeds many performance criteria and standards

3. Satisfactory: Meets all performance criteria and standards

4. Improvement Needed:

A. Student Contact performance criteria and standards

B. College Service performance criteria and standards c . Professional Service and Development performance criteria and standards [NOTE: Specific areas needing improvement must be identified, and a time line and process agreed upon for achieving and then assessing the improvement indicated, since this win form the basis for the following year's evaluation activities.]

5. Unsatisfactory: Fails to meet performance criteria and standards in many areas [NOTE: "Unsatisfactory" may be indicated only after a faculty member has received an evaluation indicating "Improvement Needed", been given a reasonable opportunity to make the improvements indicated, but has not shown improvement.

N. In the case of an assessment of "Improvement Needed" the Evaluation Team will recommend a choice of activities for improvement.

1. These could include, but are not limited to, peer consultation, course work, or in-service activities.

2. The District and the Evaluation Team win make every effort to assist and support the faculty member in achieving the needed improvement.

0. In the case of an assessment of "Improvement Needed" the Evaluation Team and the faculty member will agree upon a process and a time line for additional review in the following year.

1. For this follow-up review the Evaluation Team will automatically include as an active member the appropriate Administrator.

2. This process will begin with the faculty member's setting of specific goals and identification of activities by the end of the fourth week of the year following the initial Team Evaluation.

3 . The Evaluation Team will complete additional review by February I of the year following the initial Team Evaluation. At that time the Evaluation Team will submit a second Summary Report.

A. If the second Summary Report indicates an assessment of satisfactory or better, the next evaluation will occur on the three year cycle, with the year of the second summary report serving as year one of that cycle.

B. If the second Summary Report indicates an assessment of "Improvement Needed" the procedure outlined above will be followed for the following year.

C. If the second Summary Report indicates an assessment of "Unsatisfactory" the District may take action in accordance with Article 4 of the Education Code. June 1994

P. The faculty member must be sent the final Summary Report by April 1 to review; at that time the Evaluation Team must set a date for a discussion with the faculty member. Following the discussion, at the same meeting as the discussion, the faculty member sips the final Summary Report. The discussion and signing of the final Summary Report must be completed by April 15. The faculty member's signature acknowledges discussion, but not necessarily agreement with the final report. Following the signing of the Summary Report the faculty member shall have 10 working days in which to submit a response for inclusion with the Summary Report.

Q. In addition to the material identified in paragraph K above as permanent Faculty Portfolio items, the Evaluation Team's final Summary Report, and any response, becomes a part of the permanent Faculty Portfolio which will be forwarded to the Academic Affairs Office for placement in the faculty member's personnel file.

???R. **Santa Rosa Junior College** observes Education Code Section 87031, which reads: Information (in the personnel file) of a derogatory nature shall not be entered or filed unless and until the employee is given notice and an opportunity to review and comment thereon. An employee shall have the right to enter, and have attached to any such derogatory statement, his own comments thereon. Such review shall take place during normal business hours, and the employee shall be released from duty for this purpose without salary reduction.

South Puget Sound Community College, WA (WA024.TXT)

Agreement. 17 ARTICLE X: TENURED/NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY EVALUATION

Evaluations may include administrative, student, peer, and self-evaluations. In keeping with the mission of the College, the goal

B. Evaluation of classroom faculty shall include:

1. Self-evaluations using the standard Self-Evaluation instrument.

2. Peer evaluations using the standard Peer Evaluation Guideline.
3. Student evaluations conducted at the end of the quarter using the standard Student Evaluation form.

1. Counselors.

(a) Peer evaluations using the standard Peer Evaluation Guideline. (b) Student evaluation using the standard counselor Evaluation form.

D. There shall be a Faculty Evaluation Committee, which will include:

1. Peer evaluators: It is recommended that a maximum of four (4) persons be selected as peer evaluators. One (1) shall be selected by the instructor being evaluated. One (1) shall be selected by the division chair. Up to two (2) or more shall be selected as mutually agreed upon by the instructor and the division chair.

2. The faculty member being evaluated.

3. The faculty member's division chairperson.

4. The appropriate dean, should the faculty member being evaluated report to a dean.

E. Student evaluations will be conducted by a member of the faculty member's evaluation committee.

F. The division chair shall act as committee chair for all faculty within his/her division. If the faculty member being evaluated reports to a dean, the chair of that committee shall be the appropriate dean. G. The committee chair is responsible for convening committee meetings.

At the first committee meeting in Fall quarter an outline will be prepared of evaluation activities to take place. Individuals

responsible for various components of the evaluation process will be identified. Timeliness will be set for evaluation activities. All processes and procedures shall be reviewed. Meeting dates will be established for the remainder of the year. Other items as identified by members of the individual faculty member's evaluation committee will be addressed.

H. Committee members are responsible for reviewing and analyzing data throughout the evaluation process.

I. Committee members will discuss their findings with the individual faculty member at specified times during the year as identified at the first committee meeting. Throughout the process there will be ongoing meetings to provide feedback to the faculty member being evaluated as well as opportunity for the faculty member to comment either orally or in writing to the committee.

J. As a part of the evaluation process the most recent professional development plan will be analyzed. The committee and faculty members will develop recommended new goals and directions for the individual faculty member's future professional development. The plan shall be reviewed with the Associate Dean of Instruction.

K. The evaluation process will provide immediate feedback to instructors. Summary information from student evaluations will be shared with the faculty member after the end of the quarter during which student evaluations are conducted.

L. The evaluation information shall be considered confidential. It will be kept in the faculty member's professional development file for a maximum of three (3) years unless the individual faculty member requests the information be kept longer. Guidelines to access evaluation files will be the same as those established for the personnel files.

M. Evaluation activities can take place on or off campus, in the classroom or in the laboratory as appropriate.

N. The person being evaluated has the right to attach his or her response to the committee's recommendations if the faculty member so desires.

O. On an annual basis the appropriate dean shall review the committee's summary data (findings and recommendations) of all persons having been evaluated during the particular academic year. The dean will review the information with the faculty member being evaluated.

P. Members of the committee and the faculty member being evaluated will sign all of the documents related to the evaluation process.

Q. Summary forms will be prepared for evaluation committees so that minutes of meetings, reports and so forth will be formulated and submitted using a consistent format. Sample forms are included in the evaluation handbook. Forms will be prepared in sufficient quantity to be used by evaluators each year.

Common forms to be used in the evaluation process include:

1. The Student Evaluation form.

2. The Peer Evaluation Guide.

3. The Counselor Evaluation form.

4. The Self-Evaluation form.

R. During Spring quarter of each academic year the evaluation process may be reviewed by the members of the Faculty Evaluation Design Committee which will consist of equal representation, with two members appointed by the Federation. Recommended changes will be forwarded to the College President and the Federation by May 1st so that those Changes should they be deemed appropriate, can be incorporated into the evaluation process the next academic year. Either side may then call for a reopener on this article.

Southwestern Oregon Community College, OR (OR021.TXT)

ARTICLE IX - EVALUATION

Section 1. Peer Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
Peer evaluation of tenured faculty members shall be conducted primarily by the divisions and the Learning Resource Center. Counselors shall be considered as members of the Arts and Social Sciences Division for the purposes of peer evaluation.

Tenured faculty members shall be on a three year peer cycle. Evaluation shall be completed prior to March 1.

For two years of the three year evaluation cycle, the tenured faculty member shall submit a Report of Yearly Service to the Division Chair. The Division Chair will submit the report to the Dean of Instructional & Student Services.

For one year of the three year evaluation cycle, the tenured faculty member will undergo a peer evaluation by a three person committee. The Division Chair, a faculty member chosen by the person to be evaluated and a tenured faculty member of the division chosen randomly shall comprise the peer evaluation committee.

The peer evaluation committee will be invited to observe the faculty member's work and review recent student evaluation forms. After the observation and review, a conference shall be held to discuss the observations and offer suggestions to improve the quality of the educational experience.

The peer evaluation committee shall forward positive evaluations and recommendations to the appropriate Manager.

In the event of a negative evaluation by a majority of the evaluation committee the tenured members of the division will meet to discuss the issue and to determine what action should be taken. Action may include future evaluation.

If the tenured members of the division confirm the negative evaluation of the peer evaluation committee, the recommendation of the division shall be forwarded to the appropriate Manager for appropriate action.

Section 2. Untenured Faculty
The Division Chair and tenured faculty members of the division will confer with the untenured faculty member for the purpose of establishing evaluative procedures, using methods outlined in the present Report of Yearly Service as a guide. This meeting must be held by November 1, of each academic year.

Each year, prior to March 1, all untenured faculty members normally will be evaluated by the tenured faculty within their respective divisions. The evaluation will:

a. Assess the effectiveness of the untenured faculty member as an instructor in his/her division.

b. Assist the instructor in the performance of his/her duties for the purpose of determining whether or not an untenured faculty member should be retained, and if appropriate, whether to grant tenure.

The faculty member's overall service to the college shall be considered when determining the desirability of retaining him/her or granting tenure.

The evaluation will be carried out by a Tenure Review Committee composed of the Division Chairman and at least four tenured faculty members of that division. In the event a division has fewer than five tenured faculty members, the number will be supplemented in the following manner: the faculty member being evaluated and the Division Chair will alternately choose tenured faculty members of their choice until an appropriate number has been reached. The faculty member shall have the first choice.

Recommendations of the Tenure Review Committee regarding retention or tenure will be forwarded to the appropriate Manager. The Manager will then forward this information along with his/her

own recommendation to the president of the college. If the recommendation of the committee, the recommendation of the Manager and the recommendation of the president are in agreement, they will be forwarded to the Board of Education for action.

In case there is a difference in the recommendations, a meeting will be held between the parties to discuss the differences. All reasons for granting or not granting tenure will be discussed at this meeting. If agreement can not be reached at this point, all recommendations will be forwarded to the Board of Education for action.

The faculty member will be informed of any adverse recommendation. The faculty member shall have a right to appear before the Evaluation Committee, the joint meeting of the Tenure Review Committee, Manager and President which meet to consider cases where there are differences in recommendations, and the Board of Education to respond to any adverse recommendations and to present evidence to support his/her retention. The faculty member may be accompanied by counsel and/or a representative of the Federation. Such meeting shall be held in executive session.

---

c. The arbitrator shall decide all substantive and procedural issues arising under this Agreement. Upon

Union County College, NJ (NJ030.TXT)

ARTICLE XIII

XIII. PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION

A. The Board retains its inherent right to establish criteria for reappointment, promotion, and professional evaluations. However, for the duration of this Agreement, the Board agrees to use the criteria set forth in this Agreement, to evaluate faculty being considered for reappointment, promotion, and other professional evaluations.

---

3. Procedure

Prior to November 24 of the academic year, 4 Departmental Evaluation Committees consisting of no less than three (3) elected members shall review the record files of all tenured faculty members who are not being considered for promotion and who are to be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of Part D, Section 1 of this Article. In the event the departmental committees evaluation of a faculty

member is negative, the departmental committee will also forward recommendations for the faculty member's improvement to the Tenured Faculty Review Committee and the faculty member. On or before December 15 of the academic year, the Departmental Evaluation Committee shall send the results of its evaluation to the Tenured Faculty Review Committee.

If an individual faculty member disagrees with the conclusions or recommendations of the Departmental Evaluation Committee, s/he may forward a letter stating the objections to the chairperson of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee prior to February 1 of the academic year.

The Tenured Faculty Review Committee shall review the record files of all tenured faculty members who are not being considered for promotion and who are to be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of Part D, Section 1 of this Article prior to March 15 of the academic year. On or before April 15 of each academic year, the Tenured Faculty Review Committee shall send the results of its evaluation to the faculty member and the appropriate Academic Officer. In the event the Committee's evaluation of a faculty member is negative, the Committee will also forward recommendations for the faculty member's improvement. If the Tenured Faculty Review Committee's conclusions and recommendations are different from those of the Departmental Evaluation Committee, a letter of explanation will also be forwarded to the faculty member and the appropriate Academic Officer.

If a faculty member disagrees with the conclusions or the recommendations of the Tenured Faculty Review Committee, s/he may forward a letter stating the objections to the Tenured Faculty Review Committee and the appropriate Academic Officer prior to the conclusion of the academic year; this letter will be made part of the record file.

4. An appropriate Academic Officer shall be entitled to visit the classroom of any tenured faculty member being evaluated in his or her division, provided the faculty member receives written notice five (5) class days in advance of the visit. The appropriate Academic Officer will arrive before the class begins and stay until the end of the class.

5. If a faculty member receives a negative evaluation from the departmental Evaluation Committee or the Tenured Faculty Review Committee or both, a conference shall be held between the appropriate Academic Officer and the faculty member as soon as possible after the completion of the evaluation. The purpose of the conference shall be to develop a plan of action for the faculty member's improvement which is consistent with the Departmental Evaluation Committee's and/or the Tenured Faculty Review Committee's recommendations.

---

2. Peer evaluations

a. Peer evaluations shall be conducted by a faculty member from the candidate's department, chosen by the faculty member with the approval of
40

the chairperson. The faculty member to be evaluated and the faculty member to do the evaluation shall agree upon a time for the evaluation. Within one week of the evaluation, the evaluator shall submit a written report to the faculty member evaluated and the Department Chairperson. If the faculty member evaluated wishes, s/he may append a written response to the report before placing it in his/her record file.

b. It is recommended that at least one peer evaluation be done each year for tenured faculty and two per year for those who have not attained tenure.

Victor Valley Community College, CA (CA056.TXT)

It is the individual faculty members responsibility to prepare, assemble, and deliver the self-evaluation material to peer reviewers and their dean.

b) Peer Evaluation

Selection - Reviewers on the tenured evaluation committee will be appointed by the appropriate administrator and approved by the Faculty Association executive officers.

At least one peer reviewer, and possibly both, should be tenured VVC faculty in the same or a closely related discipline. One of the two may be a tenured faculty member in the same discipline at another institution. In some instances, it may be appropriate to select one non-academic reviewer who is accomplished in the discipline. For example, a practitioner in a technical field may be able to provide valuable input on the practice of standards and requirement in the field by the faculty member.

Procedure - The faculty member will provide the reviewers with requested support material for the evaluation such as class outlines, syllabi, handouts, copies of exams, publications, education plans, and/or

presentations. the reviewers may choose to do class visitations. These should be provided after consultation between the reviewers and the evaluates.

After appropriate review and observation, the committee will prepare a narrative review to include the following:

- Current knowledge, understanding and competence in their discipline.

- Knowledge and application of appropriate teaching techniques.

- Instructional development and improvement efforts.

- Teaching style appropriate to course and students.

- Ability to work with fellow faculty in a considerate, cooperative, and ethical manner.

- Professional development activities.

- Professional activities.

The review should be submitted to the appropriate administrator to meet necessary deadlines.

Two-Year Colleges and Universities Referring to Peer Review, but Lacking Detailed Language on Procedures:

Adirondack Community College, NY
Atlantic Community College, Faculty, NJ
Belleville Area Community College, IL
Black Hawk Community College, Part Time, IL
Blackhawk Technical College, WI
Brookdale Community College, Faculty, NJ
Broome Community College, Faculty, NY
Butler County Community College, PA
Cayuga Community College, NY
Chemeketa Community College, OR
Cincinnati Technical College, OH
Clackamas Community College, Full Time, OR
Clark College, WA
Cloud County Community College, KS
Coast Community College District, Full Time, CA
Coast Community College District, Part Time, CA
Columbia Basin College, WA
Community College of Allegheny County, PA
Community College of Rhode Island, Faculty, RI
Community College of Spokane, WA
Cumberland County College, Faculty, NJ
Fox Valley Technical College, WI
Fulton-Montgomery Community College, NY
Green River Community College, WA
Hudson County Community College, NJ
Jackson Community College, MI
Johnson County Community College, KS
Kirkwood Community College, IA
Lakeland Community College, OH
Linn-Benton Community College, OR
Long Beach Community College, Part Time, CA
Lower Columbia College, WA
Macomb Community College, Faculty, MI
Middlesex County College, NJ
Montcalm Community College, MI
Monterey Peninsula Community College District, CA
Moraine Valley Community College, IL
Northampton County Area Community College, PA
Oakland Community College, MI
Passaic County Community College, NJ
Pierce College, WA
Portland Community College, Full Time, OR
Portland Community College, Part Time, OR
Rend Lake Community College, IL
Rogue Community College, OR
Santa Monica Community College, CA
Seattle Community College, WA
Skagit Valley Community College, WA
Solano County Community College District, CA
South Suburban College, IL
Southeaster Community College, IA

St. Clair County Community College, MI
St. Louis Community College, MO
Tacoma Community College, WA
Terra Community College, OH
Ulster County Community College, Faculty, NY
Westmoreland County Community College, PA

Contracts specifying that no peer review will be required:
Eastern Iowa Community College Cistrict, IA
Edmonds Community College, WA
Elgin Community College, IL
Everett Community College, WA

Search Criteria:

"Peer review" OR
"Peer" within 25 words of any of these:
eval*
assess*
apprais*

Four-year

Performance Review

15.32 A Performance Review of a faculty unit employee shall normally be required for the following purposes:
a. retention of a probationary faculty unit employee;
b. award of tenure; and c. promotion.

15.33 A Performance Review shall consist of a minimum of the following reviews:
a. evaluations of teaching performance, if the faculty unit employee teaches;
b. peer reviews; and
c. administrative reviews.

15.34 a. Performance Review procedures shall be approved by the President after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s).
b. Department chairs may make separate recommendations. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. If the chair makes a separate recommendation, he/she shall not participate as a member of the peer committee.
Recommendation Process for Performance Review General Provisions

15.35 The probationary and tenured faculty unit employees of the department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured full-time faculty unit employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending faculty unit employees who are being considered for retention, award of tenure, and promotion. Probationary and tenured faculty unit employees shall elect tenured full-time faculty unit employees to serve on higher level peer review committee(s). When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the peer committee, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline(s).

15.36 A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee level of peer review.

15.37 In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees.

15.38 Department and higher level peer review committee(s) may rank-order faculty unit employees recommended for promotion. The end result of a promotion ranking shall serve as a recommendation to the President.

15.39 Each peer review committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee.

15.40 The end product of each level of a Performance Review shall be a written recommendation. Such recommendation(s) shall be placed in the working Personnel Action File of the candidate.

15.41 If any stage of a Performance Review has not been completed within the specified period of time, the Performance Review(s) shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review or appropriate administrator and the faculty unit employee shall be so notified.

15.42 The President shall issue a decision regarding retention, award of tenure, or promotion. Such a decision shall be in writing and shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the affected faculty unit employee and all levels of review. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.

15.43 In order to provide appropriate time for the establishment of campus criteria and procedures for Counselor Faculty Unit Employee evaluations, the provisions of this Article shall not become applicable to Counselor Faculty Unit Employees until September 1, 1996, and earlier only at the sole discretion of the President, provided that the Union has ratified the tentative agreement on a successor Agreement by October 4, 1995. During that period of time Counselor evaluations for promotion will be conducted in accordance with Article 16 of the December 9, 1993, Agreement covering Counselor Faculty Unit Employees.

[NOTE: from grievance article]
f. The term "faculty status matter" as used in this Article shall mean a dispute involving solely a decision not to reappoint, promote, or tenure.

g. The authority of an arbitrator with respect to granting appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure shall be as follows: In cases involving appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the arbitrator shall recognize the importance of the decision not only to the individual in terms of his/her livelihood, but also the importance of the decision to the institution involved. The arbitrator shall not find that an error in procedure will overturn an appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision on the basis that proper procedure has not been followed unless:

1. there is clear and convincing evidence of a procedural error; and
2. that such error was prejudicial to the decision with respect to the grievant. The normal remedy for such a procedural error will be to remand the case to the decision level where the error occurred for reevaluation, with the arbitrator having authority in his/her judgment to retain jurisdiction. An arbitrator shall

not grant appointment, reappointment, promotion or tenure except in extreme cases where it is found that:
1. the final campus decision was not based on reasoned judgment;
2. but for that, it can be stated with certainty that appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure would have been granted; and
3. no other alternative except that remedy has been demonstrated by the evidence as a practicable remedy available to resolve the issue. The arbitrator shall make specific findings in his/her decision as to the foregoing. In the event the CSU seeks to vacate an arbitration award in the manner prescribed by the California Code of Civil Procedure, the court may, among the other matters it considers, determine whether or not the arbitrator has exceeded his/her authority with respect to the foregoing.

10.7 A faculty unit employee who has a dispute pertaining to a faculty status matter as defined by provision 10.2f shall notify the President in writing of the dispute within twenty-one (21) days from the receipt of the negative decision.

10.8 Any action in processing the dispute formally shall be postponed for a period of up to twenty-five (25) days, during which period the employee shall pursue efforts to resolve the dispute informally and shall be entitled to a good faith review of the issue(s) presented. Upon the employee's further written request, additional twenty-five (25) day extensions shall be liberally granted unless to do so would seriously impede resolution of the dispute. This effort at informal resolution shall be mandatory for all faculty status matters as defined in Article 10.2f. At the completion of a mandatory twenty-five (25) day period, or agreed-upon extensions thereof, unresolved faculty status matters shall be processed as provided for in provision 10.7.

10.9 If a dispute pertaining to a faculty status matter is not resolved to the employee's satisfaction through informal efforts, the employee may request peer review or request of the CFA that the faculty status dispute be submitted to arbitration. Such a request shall be made no later than thirty-two (32) days after serving notice of a dispute pursuant to provision 10.7. This time period shall be extended for a period equal to any mutually agreed upon extension of the twenty-five (25) day mandatory informal described in provision 10.8.

10.10 If the dispute presented pursuant to provision 10.7 above is not resolved and is a faculty status matter as defined in provision 10.2f, the employee may elect either peer review of his/her complaint as described in provision 10.9, or arbitration as described in provision 10.6 of this Article. a. If the employee desires to elect arbitration he/she may request of the CFA that the faculty status matter be submitted to arbitration. Such a request shall be made no later than seven (7) days

following conclusion of the informal resolution period. No later than twenty-one (21) days after conclusion of the formal resolution period, the CFA may by written notice to the Office of the Chancellor submit the grievance to arbitration. In the event CFA does not submit a demand for arbitration, the employee may request peer review no later than seven (7) days from receipt of the CFA decision denying arbitration. b. If the employee initially desires to elect peer review he/she may request peer review no later than thirty-two (32) days after serving notice of a dispute pursuant to provision 10.7. This time period shall be extended for a period equal to any mutually agreed upon extension of the twenty-five (25) day mandatory informal described in provision 10.8.

ARTICLE 15 EVALUATION

Process for Student Evaluations of Teaching15.15 Students may, with the concurrence of the department andadministrator, be provided an opportunity to consult with thedepartment peer review committee.

15.27 Periodic evaluations shall be conducted by the peer review committee of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator. There shall be consideration of student evaluations of teaching performance, when teaching duties have been assigned and student evaluations are avai able.

15.29 For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty unit employee's effectiveness, tenured faculty unit employees shall be subject to periodic performance evaluations at intervals of no greater than five (5) years. Such periodic evaluations shall be conducted by a peer review committee of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator. For those with teaching responsibilities, consideration shall include student evaluations of teaching performance.

15.30 A tenured faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the peer committee report of his/her periodic evaluation. The peer review committee chair and the appropriate administrator shall meet with the tenured faculty unit employee to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.

15.31 A copy of the peer committee's and the appropriate administrator's summary reports shall be placed in the tenured faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.

Performance Review

15.32 A Performance Review of a faculty unit employee shall normally be required for the following purposes:
a. retention of a probationary faculty unit employee;
b. award of tenure; and c. promotion.

15.33 A Performance Review shall consist of a minimum of the following reviews:
a. evaluations of teaching performance, if the faculty unit employee teaches;
b. peer reviews; and
c. administrative reviews.

15.34 a. Performance Review procedures shall be approved by the President after consideration of the recommendations of appropriate faculty committee(s).
b. Department chairs may make separate recommendations. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. If the chair makes a separate recommendation, he/she shall not participate as a member of the peer committee.
Recommendation Process for Performance Review General Provisions

15.35 The probationary and tenured faculty unit employees of the department or equivalent unit shall elect a peer review committee of tenured full-time faculty unit employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending faculty unit employees who are being considered for retention, award of tenure, and promotion. Probationary and tenured faculty unit employees shall elect tenured full-time faculty unit employees to serve on higher level peer review committee(s). When there are insufficient eligible members to serve on the peer committee, the department shall elect members from a related academic discipline(s).

15.36 A faculty unit employee shall not serve on more than one (1) committee level of peer review.

15.37 In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees.

15.38 Department and higher level peer review committee(s) may rank-order faculty unit employees recommended for promotion. The end result of a promotion ranking shall serve as a recommendation to the President.

15.39 Each peer review committee evaluation report and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee.

15.40 The end product of each level of a Performance Review shall be a written recommendation. Such recommendation(s) shall be placed in the working Personnel Action File of the candidate.

15.41 If any stage of a Performance Review has not been completed within the specified period of time, the Performance Review(s) shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review or appropriate administrator and the faculty unit employee shall be so notified.

15.42 The President shall issue a decision regarding retention, award of tenure, or promotion. Such a decision shall be in writing and shall include the reasons for the decision. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the affected faculty unit employee and all levels of review. A copy of the decision shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.

15.43 In order to provide appropriate time for the establishment of campus criteria and procedures for Counselor Faculty Unit Employee evaluations, the provisions of this Article shall not become applicable to Counselor Faculty Unit Employees until September 1, 1996, and earlier only at the sole discretion of the President, provided that the Union has ratified the tentative agreement on a successor Agreement by October 4, 1995. During that period of time Counselor evaluations for promotion will be conducted in accordance with Article 16 of the December 9, 1993, Agreement covering Counselor Faculty Unit Employees.

Performance Salary Step Increases

31.17 The parties are committed to provide special incentives for outstanding or meritorious performance in the area of teaching, as well as other professional accomplishments and service to the University community. This shall constitute the interim academic year 1995/96 criteria for this Performance Salary Step Increase program in the event that local standards and criteria are not established pursuant to the timelines and procedures provided below.

31.21 Applications for Performance Salary Step Increases shall be reviewed by:
a. the department and/or other appropriate campus committee of tenured faculty unit employees, and
b. academic administrators and/or the president. .22 Campuses may establish additional levels of review for Performance Salary Step Increases, provided that the additional review procedures do not prevent the award of increases by January 1 of each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases.

31.23 Applications/nominations for Performance Salary Step Increases may be reviewed by the department chair in cases where the department chair is not a member of the department or other appropriate review committee. The review by department chairs shall take place after review by a departmental or other appropriate faculty committee; and before review by any school, college or university level faculty review committee.

31.24 All levels of review shall forward all applications/nominations, as well as its recommendation on each of the applications/nominations, to the next level of review each year in which negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases are awarded.

31.25 Faculty members shall not review his/her own application/nomination for a Performance Salary Step Increase. Recommendations may include not only whether the candidate is recommended to receive a Performance Salary Step Increase, but how many steps are recommended for those candidates receiving a positive recommendation. Failure to meet any established deadline for recommendations shall automatically result in the forwarding of all applications/nominations to the next level of review.

31.26 If there are insufficient tenured faculty unit employees available to comprise a departmental or other appropriate review committee, a campus may utilize tenured faculty from other departments or administrative units in forming a review committee.

31.29 At least fifty percent (50%) of the candidates receiving a Performance Salary Step Increase must have received a positive recommendation from the highest level faculty committee provided that:
a. The highest level faculty review committee makes a positive recommendation for enough candidates to fully expend the campus' pool for Performance Salary Step Increases in that fiscal year, and
b. The highest level faculty review committee meets the time requirement for the review and recommendation of all candidates to the President by the date specified in provision 31.28 above.

31.30 If the highest level faculty review committee submits fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the campus' pool for Performance Salary Step Increases in any fiscal year, then the percentage of candidates receiving a Performance Salary Step Increase that must also have received a positive recommendation from the highest level faculty review committee shall be reduced proportionately from fifty percent (50%). The percentage of candidates receiving a Performance Salary Step Increase and with a positive recommendation from the highest level faculty committee must be at least fifty percent (50%) of the number of positive recommendations received divided by the minimum number of recommendations required.

31.31 As used in this article, the term "highest level faculty review committee" shall be defined as the last faculty review committee on any campus that makes its recommendations to an academic administrator or the President.
31.32 The amount of funds dedicated to this program in the CSU in

fiscal year 1995/96 shall be $900,000. The amount of funds dedicated to this program on each campus in fiscal year 1995/96 shall be based upon the number of filled full-time equivalent faculty positions. There shall be no requirement to allocate funds for Performance Salary Step Increases to the school, college or any other organizational unit on a campus. However, such an allocation on a campus by a president is not prohibited under this Agreement.

31.36 Candidates who have received a favorable recommendation from the highest level faculty committee and who subsequently fail to receive a Performance Salary Step Increase, shall be eligible to have the increase denial reviewed by a Peer Review Panel as provided below. All requests for Peer Review must be submitted in writing to the Vice President of Academic Affairs no later than April 15, 1996, and no later than January 15 of each year in which negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases are awarded in the future. This Peer Panel Review shall be the sole forum for any reconsideration of any denial of a Performance Salary Step Increase.

31.37 The President shall establish a panel consisting of all full-time tenured faculty. No employee may be eligible for this panel if he/she has been directly involved with the salary denial reconsideration submitted by the employee to peer review.

31.38 The membership of the Peer Panel to review a specific Performance Salary Step denial shall be selected by lot from the panel established pursuant to provision 31.37 and consist of three (3) members and one (1) alternate.

31.39 The Peer Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within fourteen (14) days of its selection by lot. The panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the nominee and the Employer's written response to any allegations made by the affected employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, if the administrator chooses, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in this section.

31.40 The proceeding set forth in 31.39 above shall not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing.

31.41 No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the Peer Panel shall submit to the President and the complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the Peer Panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the panel has complied with this section, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case. A panel may be established to hear more than one case under this section.

31.42 The President shall consider the Peer Panel's recommendations and all forwarded materials and, no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the Peer Panel's report, notify the affected employee and the Peer Panel of his/her final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification to the employee of the President's decision concludes the peer review procedure and such decision shall not be reviewable in any forum.
Service Salary Step Increases

Carleton University, ON (ON001.TXT)

26.4 Peer-Evaluation

(a) Where evaluations of teaching effectiveness by academic peers (i.e. other teaching employees) are used, they shall (except as allowed by Article 26.4(b)) be restricted to consideration of the topics identified in Article 26.3(a), but need not include consideration of all of them. Any such evaluation shall be written and signed, and shall clearly identify which of the topics is being considered.

26.4 (b) Peer evaluations may also consider the extent to which the methods and material used by an instructor achieved the objectives of the course as identified by the instructor, provided such evaluations do not violate Article 4, Academic Freedom.

26.4 (c) Peer evaluations shall contain a written statement of the evidence on which the evaluations were made and the circumstances in which the evidence was collected. Only evidence which is reasonably reliable and reasonably indicative of the characteristic being evaluated may be used.

(d) Peer evaluations shall be presented, complete, in accordance with the provisions of this Article, and in written form, sufficiently in advance of their being used for any purpose to allow an instructor to respond to them in writing.

26.5 Subject to the provisions of Article 26.7 evaluations of teaching effectiveness which meet the requirements of this Article may be used in consideration of renewal of appointment (Articles 6 and 9), tenure (Article 6), or confirmation (Articles 11 and 12), promotion (Article 10), or denial of increments (Article 41) provided for in this Collective Agreement.

26.6 All evaluations of teaching used for purposes of career decisions shall meet the requirements of this Article. Evaluations of teaching used for other purposes shall be used only with the permission of the employee.

30.9 Exclusions from the Grievance Procedure

(a) Recognizing that certain review procedures involving complex forms of academic peer judgement have evolved out of

continuous practical experience, the parties agree that the grievance procedures under this Article shall not be available for resolution of disputes, exclusively concerned with employment equity appointments (Article 9.3), faculty promotions (Article 10.1 - 10.4), renewal of preliminary faculty appointments (Article 6.2(a)), tenure (Article 6.2(a)), and
30.9 (a) dismissal for cause of faculty employees (Article 6.2(a)), professional librarian employees (Article 11.4), instructor employees (Article 12.5), except where the employee or the Association alleges violation of Academic Freedom under Article 4, or discrimination under Article 5 of this Collective Agreement, or except where the employee or the Association alleges that a violation of the procedures established in Article 10 or under the Senate/Board document entitled Procedures Concerning Tenure, Dismissal and Related Matters, as approved by the Board of Governors on the 27th June, 1972 and as amended by the Board of Governors on the 4th October, 1972, and as modified by this Collective Agreement has occurred.

26.1 The purpose of this Article is to provide regulations for the implementation of the objectives of Senate's policy on Teaching Evaluation, as adopted at meetings held on October 26th, November 24th and December 6th, 1976.

26.2 (a) A primary purpose of any teaching evaluation is that of self-development and improvement.
(b) Teaching effectiveness may be evaluated by student questionnaires and by academic peers, so long as such evaluations are in accord with the regulations below and with other provisions of this Collective Agreement.

Connecticut State University System, CT (CT001.TXT)

---

4. 1 1. Evaluation of Full-time Members for Renewal, Tenure and Promotion (See Table 1)

4. 1 1. 1. Evaluation Procedure. There shall be only one (1) evaluation procedure leading to recommendations regarding promotion, tenure and renewal of full-time members as follows: in accordance with procedures developed by the Senate and approved by the President in an expeditious manner, evaluations of teaching members shall be conducted by the Department Evaluation Committee (DEC) of which the Department Chairperson may be a member, ex-officio, and by the University-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4.12 Professional Assessment

Each tenured member shall receive one professional assessment every six (6) years unless: (a) the DEC, in an effort to assist, schedules the next assessment in less than six (6) years, or (b) the affected member requests more frequent assessment. The DEC shall honor such requests. The purpose of this assessment shall be to measure the member's teaching effectiveness, and/or primary professional function, service to the department and university, scholarship and professional activity in order to further the member's professional growth. This assessment shall be made by the DEC in accordance with procedures developed by the Senate and approved by the President pursuant to Article 5.10, and in accordance with Articles 4.11.6 - 4.11.9 of this Agreement. Professional assessments shall follow a schedule recommended by the Senate and approved by the President. A DEC may schedule an increased frequency of assessment only on the occasion of a regularly scheduled assessment. Information developed by DEC for promotion and tenure evaluations may be used for professional assessments. Where this is the campus practice, another assessment shall not be required for six (6) years. All assessments completed by a DEC will be reviewed by the member, who shall be provided at least two (2) days to append comment before the assessment is sent to the appropriate Dean. All assessments which have been reviewed by the member will be sent promptly to the Dean along with all materials reviewed by the DEC and any comments from the member. The Academic Vice President and President will review the assessment in turn after the Dean.

Assessments reviewed by the President will be placed along with member comments in the member's personnel file. After placement of the assessment in the member's file, supporting documents will be returned to the DEC for disposal. The format for these assessments shall be proposed by the Senate and approved by the President.

4.13 Special Assessment

When the appropriate Dean or Vice President has reasonable grounds to believe there is a problem regarding a member's performance of duties, the Dean shall meet with the member, and any other appropriate individuals, in an attempt to clarify and, if necessary, rectify the situation. If, following such meeting(s), the Dean or Vice President determines that a special assessment is
called for, the Dean shall meet and confer with the appropriate chairperson in the design of an appropriate evaluation, which may or may not involve the DEC, and shall inform the affected member of the particulars of the scheduled evaluation. The evaluator (s) shall report the results of the evaluation to the Dean, the Chairperson and the affected member.

Should the evaluation identify matters requiring remedy, the evaluators and the affected member shall meet to discuss and identify remedies deemed appropriate by consensus of the evaluators. The member shall have the right to choose among the

remedies. The evaluators shall provide a written copy of their evaluation and the agreed upon remedy to the affected member, the Dean or Vice President and the member's personnel file. The appropriate remedy preferred by the member shall be implemented. The Dean or Vice President shall, with appropriate consultation, establish a schedule of compliance or means of monitoring the compliance. If the member fails to cooperate, the matter may be remanded to the process of Article 16. In the event that the member in question is the spokesperson or the department Chairperson, that role in the process shall be filled by the Chairperson of the DEC.

15.6.2 No individual or group shall substitute its judgment for that of a committee, administrators, or the Board on questions of substance or merit in discretionary decisions except as specified in Article 12.11. This section shall not apply to grievances processed under Article 16.

Delaware State University, DE (DE003.TXT)

In accordance with the provisions concerning Department governance in Article XIX of this Agreement, the unit members of the Department shall establish a

Departmental Personnel Committee of tenured, faculty members to make recommendations concerning appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of members of the Department and to conduct peer evaluations for the above purposes. Counselors and Librarians operate as a committee of the whole. Such a committeeshall serve as the Departments means of establishing peer review procedures. Al recommendations shall be submitted in writing.

In the event that a Department lacks tenured, faculty members, the Departmental committee shall be composed of other faculty members of the Department in order of seniority.

8.6.7 In addition to the Departmental Personnel Committee's recommendations, Departmental peers who have chosen to evaluate a candidate or who have been requested by the Chairperson, Academic Director or Head Librarian to evaluate a candidate or other peers who may have been requested to evaluate the candidate shall submit their signed recommendations to the Chairperson, Academic Director or Head Librarian who shall forward the complete dossier to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and a copy thereof shall be provided to the candidate. In the event of a negative recommendation, reasons shall be stated in writing and in detail.

ARTICLE XI

ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

11.2 Unit members will be evaluated in the following areas: teaching and/or performance of professional responsibilities, professional growth and recognition, and contributions to the University and community. The methods of evaluation of faculty will include student evaluations, peer evaluation, classroom observation, Chairperson evaluation and administrative evaluation. The method of evaluation of non-teaching unit members will include peer evaluation and Academic Director or Head Librarian evaluations. Probationary faculty, Instructors, and non-teaching unit members shall be evaluated annually during the Spring Semester. After a faculty member has achieved tenure, the faculty member will be evaluated every third year during the Spring semester. However, if the evaluation of a tenured faculty member is less than satisfactory, he/she will be evaluated annually until the deficiencies have been corrected. Upon request to the Department Chairperson or Director, any unit member may elect to be evaluated during a semester, whether or not such evaluation falls within the above schedule.

11.3 Professional Departmental evaluations of unit members shall be conducted by:

a. Departmental Chairpersons, Academic Directors or Head Librarian regardless of rank, tenure, or others who are directly responsible for the performance of unit members;

b. Tenured Departmental peers of the faculty member being evaluated. In departments in which tenured peers are not available for evaluation, the Personnel Committee shall recommend to the department those disciplines which are most related. Upon approval of the Department, the Committee shall compile a list of two tenured peers. In addition, the Chair shall recommend two tenured peers from those disciplines and forward both lists to the appropriate Academic Dean. The appropriate Academic Dean shall randomly select two peers and shall notify the Department Personnel Committee and the selected peers. There shall be a minimum of two (2) peer evaluations for the unit member.

11.4 Evaluations shall be taken into consideration by those individuals or committees charged with the responsibility of recommending or not recommending candidates for promotion, tenure, reappointment, merit increases or other personnel decisions. No particular weight shall be given to one kind of evaluation - student, Chairperson, peer, over another; however, in some cases, it may be necessary for further professional evaluations to be conducted. In such cases, the appropriate Academic Dean, Vice President or the members of the Promotion and

Tenure Committee, or members of an ad hoc committee charged with making recommendations regarding either dismissal or financial exigency may also choose to conduct professional evaluations of unit members.

11.5 While any evaluation carries with it certain subjective judgments, those charged with rendering professional evaluations are obligated to do so in an objective and honest manner.

11.6 Unit members have the right to know what is contained in any evaluation done by a Chairperson, peers, or those in the administration charged with such responsibility. Unit members shall be accorded the opportunity to discuss the evaluations with the Chairperson, and/or the appropriate administrator. At such time, unit members shall be given a copy of all professional evaluations and asked to initial the originals. Such initialing shall not be construed as agreement or disagreement, but merely an indication that the unit member has seen the evaluation and been given a copy. Unit members have the right to respond in writing to any or all of the evaluations; such response shall be submitted no later than ten (10) working days from the time that the affected unit member received copies of the evaluations and shall be included and made part of the personnel file. When oral testimony contradicts written evaluations, the affected unit member shall be informed of the oral testimony and be given an opportunity to respond to it.

11.7 Student evaluations for faculty members and counselors shall be conducted every year. Such evaluations shall be presented in summary form so as to preserve the anonymity of students. During the life of this contract, student evaluations shall remain with the Department Chairperson or Director of Counseling where discussions concerning such evaluations shall take place. Copies of summary student evaluations will be provided to the concerned unit member and counselor upon request. Unit members and counselors shall be granted the opportunity to respond to such evaluations. Student evaluations shall be included in the faculty and counselors personnel file. Summaries of the student evaluations shall be provided to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

11.8 When any unit member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation, it shall be the responsibility of the Department Chairperson, Academic Director, or Head Librarian to develop a prescriptive plan that is deemed necessary in order to rectify the deficiency. The prescriptive plan shall be reported to the appropriate Dean. Should the unit member refuse to follow the prescriptive plan, he/she may be subject to dismissal or non-reappointment under Article X of this Agreement. Probationary faculty members and other unit members being considered for reappointment shall be evaluated according to the criteria set forth in Article VIII of this Agreement.

11.9 The annual evaluation of probationary unit members shall

form the basis for their reappointment. The unit member shall receive a copy of his/her annual evaluation at a conference between the unit member, the Department Chairperson, Academic Directors, and Head Librarian, and the appropriate Academic Dean. The evaluation shall result in an Individual Development Plan that will guide the unit member in achieving professional excellence and promotion. The annual evaluation shall be signed by the unit members to reflect recognition but not necessarily agreement with the evaluation. The unit member shall have the night to attach a statement of amendment or rebuttal to the evaluation. All probationary faculty shall be evaluated in the spring of their first year and the fall of their second year.

11.10 General Procedures for Evaluations

11.10.1 Student Evaluations of Faculty Members

Student evaluations of teaching performance shall be conducted each year by the administration. Student evaluations shall be conducted during the month of November for the Fall semester, and during the month of March during the Spring semester.

11.10.2 Chairpersons, Academic Directors and Head Librarian Evaluation of Unit Members: They have the responsibility of evaluating, according to the frequency set forth in Section 2, all members of their Department. Techniques of evaluation for faculty shall include, but not be limited to, classroom observation, review and analysis of course outlines, exams, and graded papers, review of publications and professional development; and other evidence of professional and teaching proficiency. Techniques for evaluation of non-teaching unit members shall include professional services to the University and community and professional development. While there are many means of arriving at a considered judgment regarding the performance of a faculty member, classroom observation is the most direct means of evaluating the performance of a faculty member whose primary responsibilities include teaching. Chairpersons must indicate on the evaluation form the date(s) that classroom observation occurred. For those being evaluated during the Fall semester, Chairpersons must conduct the evaluation; review the evaluation with the faculty member, provide a copy to the faculty member; retain a copy for Department files; and submit a copy of the evaluation to the appropriate Academic Dean on or before October 31. For those being evaluated during the Spring semester, Chairpersons shall conduct the evaluation; review the evaluation with the faculty member, provide a copy for the faculty member, retain a copy for Departmental files; and submit a copy of the evaluation to the appropriate Academic Dean on or before February 1st. Evaluation of non-teaching unit members must be submitted to the appropriate Academic Dean by the above dates.

11.10.3 Peer Evaluations of Unit Members: The Association and the University agree that peer evaluation is a desirable part of the

evaluation process. Techniques of evaluation for faculty shall include, but not be limited to, classroom observation; review and analysis of course outlines; exams and graded papers; review of publications and professional development; other evidence of professional and teaching proficiency; and community service. Techniques of evaluation of non-teaching unit members shall include a review of the professional services to the University and community and professional development. In departments in which tenured peers are not available for evaluation, the Personnel Committee shall recommend to the department those disciplines which are most related. Upon approval of the Department, the Committee shall compile a list of two tenured peers. In addition, the Chair shall recommend two tenured peers from those disciplines and forward both lists to the appropriate Academic Dean. The appropriate Academic Dean shall randomly select two peers and shall notify the Department Personnel Committee and the selected peers. Peers shall complete their evaluation of those being considered for promotion or tenure and submit said evaluation to the Chairperson of the Department prior to the Chairperson's, Academic Director's, or Head Librarian's review of evaluations with the unit member. All other evaluations done by peers shall be submitted to the Department Chairperson, Academic Director or Head Librarian prior to the Chairperson's, Academic Director's and Head Librarian's review of evaluations with the unit member. The Chairperson shall provide the faculty member with a copy of the peer evaluations, retain a copy for the Department file, and submit a copy to the appropriate Academic Dean for inclusion in the personnel file not later than February 1st.

11.10.4 Classroom Observation: Classroom observation shall be done at times convenient to the affected faculty member. The affected faculty member shall be given at least forty-eight (48) hours notice that a classroom observation is to be made. If an exam or other such written or non-classroom assignment has been previously scheduled, arrangements shall be made to observe the class at another time. Faculty members, including candidates for promotion and tenure, must be evaluated through classroom observation by the Chairperson, and should expect and encourage other peers to visit and observe their classes. Classroom observations shall be conducted well in advance of the formal evaluation. The Department Chairperson and peer evaluators shall independently discuss the results of the classroom observation with the affected faculty member within two (2) weeks following the observations.

Rutgers University, NJ (NJ025.TXT)

Appendix B

Faculty Academic Service Increment Program

A. Criteria

To the extent of funds available, academic service increments may be awarded to faculty members who have demonstrated recent and continuing excellence based on one or more of the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, academic service increments may be awarded to faculty members whose current compensation warrants special consideration on the basis of academic or professional contributions in comparison with compensation of colleagues of similar achievement in the department or discipline at large.

---

3. Departments with four or more tenured members shall elect a Peer Evaluation Committee of at least three members, composed of tenured members of the department. In departments with fewer than four tenured members, all the tenured members shall constitute the Peer Evaluation Committee. In departments without tenured members, there shall be no Peer Evaluation Committee.

Nominations for the committee may be made by any tenured member of the department. Elections to the committee shall be by secret ballot of all full- time members of the department holding the rank of Assistant Professor or above who are not in their terminal year. The department chairperson shall convene, be a non-voting member of, and participate in the deliberations of the Committee.

4. The Peer Evaluation Committee shall meet to evaluate all members of the department who are not members of the Committee, who are eligible for consideration for an academic service increment, and who have not notified the chairperson that they do not wish to be considered for an academic service increment. The Committee shall determine, from among those faculty members considered, those who it will recommend for an academic service increment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in A. above. The Committee shall prepare a summary statement of its evaluation for each member of the department it recommends, shall indicate which one or more of those criteria is the basis for its recommendation, and shall rank the individuals. At each level of review it shall be indicated which one or more of the criteria is the basis for the recommendation.

5. Subsequent to completing the evaluation process set forth in 4. above, The Peer Evaluation Committee, at its option, may make recommendations to the department chairperson, within the guidelines set forth in section D. above, concerning the size of the academic service increment for those individuals whom the Committee has recommended for receipt of such an increment. If the committee chooses to make such recommendations, the

chairperson shall provide to the Committee, in confidence, the salary for each individual recommended by the Committee for an academic service increment.

6. After the deliberations of the Peer Evaluation Committee are complete, the chairperson may either (a) endorse the Committee's recommendations and ranking, incorporating the names of the members of the Committee whom the chairperson judges meet the criteria for an academic service increment, or (b) prepare an independent ranked list of all of those faculty members in the department who, in the judgement of the chairperson, should receive an academic service increment. In addition, the chairperson shall review the salaries of members of the department and shall make recommendations, within the guidelines set forth in section D. above, as to the size of the academic service increment for individuals on his/her list. The chairperson will then forward his/her recommendations and those of the Peer Evaluation Committee to the dean with justification and appropriate documentation. The chairperson will also forward with these recommendations the statement of the department, as specified in E. above, although the statement shall not be binding on the dean in his/her deliberations.

7. Upon receipt of the nominees from each of the department chairpersons within the unit, the dean shall formulate a ranked list of nominees from among those proposed by the departments and including such department chairpersons and other faculty members not proposed by the departments who, in the judgement of the dean, are qualified, according to the criteria specified in A. above, for an academic service increment. The dean's list shall include the dean's recommendation as to the size of the academic service increment for each individual on the list. Should the dean wish to include on his/her list an individual who the chairperson has not recommended for an academic service increment or should the dean wish to increase the size of an academic service increment over the amount recommended by the chairperson, the dean shall first discuss the matter with the chairperson. The dean will forward his/her recommendations to the provost with justification and appropriate documentation. The dean will, at the same time, forward to the provost the recommendations of the Peer Evaluation Committees and department chairs.

8. The provost shall review the recommendations from the several deans, directors, chairpersons, and department committees and, from among the recommended faculty members and to the extent of funds allocated to his/her campus, shall make a final determination as to which faculty members on the campus shall receive academic service increments and as to the size of each increment, except that the provost may not increase the size of an academic service increment over the amount recommended by the dean.

9. The President will receive from each of the campus provosts a list of the provost's actions and a list of remaining faculty

members recommended by the dear., the department chair, and/or the Peer Evaluation Committee for an academic service increment. The President may select from these lists a number of additional academic service increment recipients, who, in the President's judgement, best meet the criteria specified in A. above. Such additional Presidential awards shall be limited to 5% of the total funds available under this program.

G. Implementation

The University will notify individual faculty members who have been recommended for consideration for an academic service increment of the action taken in regard to that recommendation. For each such faculty member, the University will inform the AAUP of the faculty member's department, campus, academic rank, and range and step before and after award of the academic service increment, if any; the level of the initial recommendation for award; the reason for the recommendation, specified in A. above, and whether the faculty member was a member of the department Peer Evaluation Committee and/or a department chairperson.

Subsequent to the conclusion of the award process, the evaluation packets will be returned to the office of the dean. The dean will notify the department chairpersons of the results of the academic service increment process for their department, that the material is available for review by them, and the dean will indicate his/her availability to discuss the academic service increment process with the department chairperson. The chairperson shall inform the Peer Evaluation Committee of the substance of such a discussion. Individual members of the faculty may review their own packets in accordance with the usual procedures for review of personnel files and may discuss their packets and review their professional progress with their chairperson and/or dean.

H. Grievability

The academic judgement that forms the basis of the granting or failure to grant an academic service increment, including the size of the increment, and the decision to implement the award through a range or step change are not grievable. Allegations of a violation of the procedures set forth in this Faculty Academic Service Increment Program which results in the failure to grant an academic service increment shall be brought under Article IX, Category 2 of the Agreement between the AAUP and the University.

Saginaw Valley State University, MI (MI034.TXT)

H 1.2 CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION FOR PURPOSES OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION

The following criteria provide guidelines for evaluating faculty performance. It is recognized, however, that precision is very difficult in this area and that in many cases outstanding achievement in one or more areas set forth below may justify lesser achievement in other areas. Only the criterion of teaching performance must be satisfied in all cases; and the failure to satisfy said criterion shall, by itself, serve as a bar to tenure or promotion. Performance on any one of the other criteria shall not, by itself, constitute reason for any decision for or against tenure or promotion for any faculty member. Except where specifically limited by this agreement, these criteria shall apply to any evaluation of faculty members.

The criteria are as follows:

H 1.2.1

Teaching Performance is to be evaluated by course evaluation forms, classroom visits, student evaluations, and peer evaluations. Materials related to teaching which are included in the P.P.C. file may be evaluated for the information they provide concerning innovation, creativity, organizational skills and other aspects of instructional performance. If necessary and desirable, other procedures shall be developed by agreement between the F.A. and the University. (See also F 2.4.4.)

H 2.2 EVALUATION

A written evaluation shall be completed in each of the first two years of probationary faculty. It is understood that the main purpose of this evaluation shall be (1) to aid such new faculty member in solving any problems that may exist in connection with the performance of teaching duties at SVSU and (2) to introduce said member to the standards for later evaluation of performance. The criterion of primary importance for a probationary member shall be teaching performance. A written evaluation shall be completed for pre-tenure faculty in their first pre-tenure year (and second pre-tenure year if tenure is not achieved in the first consideration) by an Evaluation Team as provided below. The primary purpose of pre-tenure evaluation shall be to evaluate teaching performance for input to the tenure evaluation of P.P.C. All faculty shall be evaluated in each of the first two years of teaching at SVSU in addition to any other provisions herein.

H 2.2.1 EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

Each school or division having probationary or pre-tenure faculty members shall establish at least one evaluation team. No team shall evaluate more than four faculty members in any single year, nor may
any faculty member be evaluated by more than one team in any

given year. The exact number of teams in a school or division shall be determined by the dean or director in consultation with departmental chairpersons and the F. A. President. Each team shall be composed of three faculty members, at least two of whom shall be tenured and all three shall have at least two years service at SVSU. The first of the three shall be appointed by the appropriate dean or director after consultation with the departmental chairperson; the second shall be appointed by the Association; and, the third shall be selected and agreed upon by the first two appointees.

Each team shall be selected during September of each year (January for mid-year appointments) and shall serve from October 1, next, (January 15 for mid-year appointments), through the end of the succeeding September. The appropriate dean or director shall convene the team(s) for a school or division by October 15 (February 15 for mid-year appointments) and the team chairperson shall then be chosen by the team from among its members. The team chairperson will be responsible for the team's meeting its deadline.

Deans or Directors shall forward a list of all probationary or pre-tenure faculty to be evaluated to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Association President and the individual faculty member on or before September 15 of each year. A list of all tenured faculty in each school and division shall be forwarded to the Association President at the same time.

H 2.2.2 SUBJECT OF EVALUATION

Probationary and Pre-Tenure Faculty: Each evaluation team shall compose a written evaluation record which may measure each faculty member being evaluated according to the following criteria:

(1) effectiveness of classroom teaching, including student class evaluation surveys and other materials which provide information concerning innovation, creativity, organizational skills and other aspects of instructional performance.

(2) scholarly or creative achievement, including contributions to the discipline and research or new learning in support of community service;

(3) service to the institution and/or the community, including committee work, on-campus leadership roles, contributions to the department, activities relevant to the discipline in the community outside the campus, and special contributions to the institution.

In the case of Probationary Faculty, the record shall also consider any special assignments or conditions contained in the initial letter of appointment.

See also Sections H 1.2.1 and G 4.10.

H 2.2.3 METHODS AND SCHEDULES

At the first meeting the evaluation team will agree upon the methods and time schedules to be used. The methods and time schedule for carrying out the evaluation shall be reduced to writing and shall become an initial record of the work of the team. The initial record plus a record of all subsequent work by the team shall be preserved in writing and shall be included with its final appraisal of the professional effectiveness of the faculty member being evaluated. The evaluation record shall then be forwarded to the evaluee and dean for review. The dean may then add such written comments, any recommendation for action regarding the evaluee, and/or pertinent material as he/she deems necessary. The record shall then be returned to the team and evaluee. The evaluee shall then be given the opportunity to review the record again, and respond in writing, if any negative material has been added and return the record to the team. The team may then add further comments or materials, if it so desires, and shall compile a brief outline of the record and its specific recommendations, an index of the complete record and a dated cover entitled "EVALUATION RECORD" and place the whole in the faculty member's P.P.C. file. The Evaluation Team shall forward its recommendation to the evaluee. All evaluees may request P.P.C. review of the evaluation record and such record shall reflect the findings of the P.P.C.

The closing time schedule for the yearly evaluations shall be as follows:

Full Year	Mid-Year	
Jan. 30	June 1	Evaluation Team forwards preliminary record to evaluee and Dean, including, if necessary, a recommendation that the evaluee formulate a Correction Plan
Feb. 10	June 12	The Dean forwards preliminary record, with additions, to evaluee and Evaluation Team
Feb. 18	June 18	Evaluee forwards response, if any, to Evaluation Team
Mar. 10	July 8	Evaluee, if desires, submits Correction Plan to the Evaluation Team, the respective Department Chairperson, and respective Dean
Mar. 17	July 15	Evaluation Team places complete record in P.P.C. files and forwards its recommendation to the evaluee
Mar. 20	July 20	Evaluee, if desires, appeals to P.P.C.

H 2.2.4 EVALUATION RECORD: CONTENTS

The evaluation record shall include the following:

1. A list of all persons participating, for what purpose, and when:

2. A brief outline of the record and the team's recommendation regarding reappointment, termination, discharge, or tenure, as appropriate;

3. An index of the complete record;

4. The team's comments and findings on each of the criteria cited in H.2.2 2., where applicable, along with such supporting documents and objective evidence as is available;

5. The Individual Evaluation Report completed jointly by the team (required for pre-tenure evaluation only).

6. The team's comments and findings with respect to correction plans, if any;

7. The team's final appraisal of the professional effectiveness of the evaluee;

8. The dean's or director's comments and recommendations for action regarding the evaluee;

9. The comments, responses and materials submitted by the evaluee in addition to any material requested of the evaluee by the team;

10. A copy of the evaluee's vita;

11. Written statement and recommendation regarding evaluee by the Department;

12. Written statements regarding the performance of the evaluee by faculty colleagues if requested by the evaluee and/or the team;

13. Recommendations for improvement in the evaluee's performance; and

14. The signatures of the members of the evaluation team.

H 2.2.5 INADEQUACY

If the evaluation team has decided that the member of the faculty evaluated is inadequate in some area which could lead to a desire on the part of the institution not to renew his/her contract, they must communicate this concern with specific reasons, to the member evaluated and to his/her department chairperson and Dean.

H 2.2.6 CORRECTION PLAN

The faculty member will submit by March 10 (July 8 for Mid-Year Evaluations) to the Evaluation Team, respective Department Chairperson, and respective Dean a plan to correct the inadequacies. Failure to submit such a plan shall be sufficient cause for non-renewal of contract regardless of date.

H 2.2.7 REASSIGNMENT

If the faculty member has been assigned duties which the evaluation process establishes as a contributing factor to his/her lack of success, the University administration shall cooperate, within the framework of available teaching positions, in making reassignments during the next registration period to facilitate the faculty member in making a successful contribution to the institution. The University administration will also cooperate in any other reasonable manner to aid in any plan of action aimed at correcting the faculty member's lack of success. Conditions over which the faculty member has no control which contributed to the faculty member's lack of success shall be considered as mitigating factors in any review for discipline or discharge purposes.

H 2.2.8 REVIEW MEETING

On receipt of the evaluation team's memorandum and the faculty member's plan for correction of inadequacies, the respective Dean shall call a meeting which will include the evaluation team, the member evaluated, the Association representative and the department chairperson to determine the adequacy of the plan and modify or redesign it if necessary. The final plan will be incorporated in the evaluation record in the P.P.C. file and performance with regard to the correction plan will be evaluated by the next year's evaluation team. If no evaluation team is normally scheduled for the next year, a special team shall be appointed as provided in H 2.2.1.

H 2.2.9. NEW EVALUATION

Following this required conference in which a correction plan has been established, an evaluation team shall undertake a re-evaluation which shall be completed by January 30 of the next appointment year. The re-evaluation shall be based solely upon the plan for correction.

performance of bargaining-unit faculty at other times thanthose specified in this Agreement, if it needs additional information in order to make personnel decisions. Such evaluations should reflect the principles and intent of evaluations described in the articles of this Agreement on reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit pay.

18.5 PEER AND SELF-EVALUATION. Evaluations of faculty by their peers may be conducted, either at the request of the faculty member or in accordance with the department's approved policy statement. Self-evaluation and peer evaluations are encouraged and may be included with the faculty member's application for tenure, promotion, reappointment or merit.

18.6 ACCESS TO COMPUTER CENTER. To administer these evaluations, the appropriate faculty committee shall have, without cost to them, access to and use of Testing Services and the Computer Center.

18.7 TERM APPOINTMENTS. Only the professional competence and service of term faculty shall be evaluated unless the term faculty member requests an evaluation of professional recognition. Term faculty shall be evaluated annually.

18.8 PEER EVALUATION. For the purpose of continued self-development, bargaining-unit faculty may request faculty in their departments to evaluate them, and departmental faculty may conduct such evaluations using contractual criteria and in accordance with the Departmental Policy Statement. Results of such evaluations shall be delivered only to the faculty member being reviewed.

22.6 PEER REVIEW.

22.6.1 Request for Review. Within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of notice of dismissal action, the faculty member may demand by letter of the Chapter and the notifying signatory a review by the committee of his/her peers of the alleged facts resulting in the charges.

22.6.2 Review Committee. If so demanded, a committee of five (5) members shall be appointed by the University president from a list of ten (10) persons holding academic rank and tenure, nominated by the Chapter. The committee shall be named within five (5) working days of the faculty member's request and shall meet no later than five (5) working days from the date it is named. The faculty member may submit to the committee a written response to the charges against him/her. The committee shall proceed by considering the charges and the faculty member's written response, if any. The committee, in consultation with the provost and the faculty member, shall exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private. The

testimony of witnesses and other evidence concerning the matters in dispute shall be received. Conduct of the hearing, the order of proof, the questioning and testimony of witnesses, and participation of other parties before the committee are thesole responsibility of the committee. Where necessary, the committee shall have the authority to secure all evidence it deems important to the case. The committee shall select its own chairman and shall serve with autonomy without influence of others, either the University or the Chapter.

22.6.2.1 The faculty member shall have the option of assistance by another faculty member, except a member of the committee, and/or by legal counsel of his/her choice. The faculty member shall have the aid of the committee and University when needed in securing the attendance of witnesses. Testimony may be presented by Western, the Chapter and the faculty and each shall have the right to question. All of the proceedings shall be recorded.

22.6.3 Committee Recommendation. The committee shall reach its recommendation in camera on the basis of evidence adduced in the hearing. Its recommendation shall be presented in writing to the president, the faculty member and the Chapter no later than ten (10) working days after the close of the hearing.

22.6.4 President's Decision. The president, after first considering the committee's recommendation, shall decide the discipline within twenty-one (21) working days. He/she shall set forth in writing this final decision and reasons for it. The committee, the faculty member and the Chapter shall receive copies.

12.9.3 Authority of Arbitrator. The arbitrator shall have no authority to add to, subtract from, change or modify any of the terms or provisions of this Agreement or the past practices and policies hereinbefore defined, but shall be limited solely to the interpretation and application of the specific provisions contained herein and the past practices and policies hereinbefore defined. The arbitrator shall not render an opinion as to whether a bargaining unit member should or should not be appointed, reappointed, terminated, laid off, or be granted tenure or promotion, but shall be limited in his/her jurisdiction on these matters to determining whether the contractual procedures have been satisfied/followed.

Western Montana College, MT (MT002.TXT)

APPENDIX 1
EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The evaluation of probationary faculty shall involve the following steps:

1. The division chair will review the evaluation process and request a professional development plan from each faculty member in the fall of each year. The division chair and the faculty member will assess progress toward the goals in this plan in the spring. The faculty member may present relevant, concise material in support of having attained these goals to the division chair.

2. Each faculty member shall choose two other faculty members each year to carry out a peer review. Names of those selected shall be submitted to the Dean of Faculty and the peer evaluation form shall be used in the evaluations. The Dean of Faculty may also contact additional faculty members to perform peer reviews on a faculty member.

3. Each division chair shall complete a yearly summary of the performance of the divisional faculty members. Progress towards attainment of goals in the professional development plan and observations of teaching from each semester shall guide this summary.

4. Students will evaluate faculty classroom performance each semester in a course chosen by the faculty member in the spring and in a course representative of the faculty assignment chosen by the Dean of Faculty in the fall. The evaluation instrument shall allow faculty members to add evaluation criteria of their choosing to the standard evaluation criteria.

5. The Dean of Faculty shall compile an evaluation summary each spring based on: teaching effectiveness; scholarly, creative and research activities; and service to the college and community. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the evaluation.

6. The summaries of the peer, student, division chair and Dean of Faculty evaluations shall be made available to the Tenure and Promotion Committee when the faculty member is considered for tenure and promotion.

7. Specified forms shall be used in the evaluation procedures. New and modified forms shall be implemented upon agreement of the Dean of Faculty and the Association President.

8. The Dean of Faculty shall appoint a substitute evaluator for the Divisional Chair in cases where the divisional chair may not be able to give a fair and impartial evaluation.

The evaluation of tenured faculty members shall involve the following steps:

1. Each faculty member may have a yearly peer review by

asking two other faculty members to fill out the peer evaluation form.

2. Each division chair may on request of the faculty member fill out an annual summary on that faculty member's performances.

3. Students will evaluate faculty classroom performance each semester in a course chosen by the faculty member and in a course representative of the faculty assignment chosen by the Dean of Faculty. The instrument shall be capable of modification to meet the needs of individual courses and faculty.

4. Summaries of all evaluations shall be made available to the Tenure and Promotion Committee when the faculty member is considered for promotion. Such evaluations shall also be available to other faculty committees evaluating faculty performance such as merit committees.

5. Specified forms shall be used in the evaluation procedures. New and modified forms shall be implemented upon agreement of the Dean of Faculty and the Association President.

6. The Dean of Faculty may appoint a substitute for the divisional chair when the divisional chair may not be able to give a fair and impartial evaluation.

#1

PEER EVALUATION FORM

Peer Evaluation of

_

Rank/Title

_

The following is a peer assessment of the professional performance of the above named faculty member.

1. Describe the effectiveness of the faculty member's teaching.

2. What has the faculty member contributed in service to the college and community?.

3. What has the faculty member contributed to scholarship, research, and creative activities?

Faculty Evaluator Rank

Evaluator's Signature Date

Western Oregon State College, OR (OR019.TXT)

Article 8. EVALUATION

Section 3. Evidence to be considered in evaluating performance shall include:

A. Evaluations of the employee's teaching or primary job assignment.

1) For those whose primary assignment includes teaching, teaching performance will be evaluated on the basis of:

a) A written peer evaluation report on the faculty member's teaching based on classroom observation and a review of syllabi, texts, tests and other class materials; and

b) Student ratings of classroom performance shall be used only as a supplement to other evaluative materials and shall be considered in relation to the level and type of class being rated -- e.g., core curriculum requirement, lower division course, or upper division course for majors.

Section 4. Evaluations for Merit. When evaluating a faculty member for merit, performance must be considered for the period of time that has elapsed since the last College merit award process and shall be based on the categories as stipulated in this article: Teaching, Research and Scholarship, Professional

Service, Institutional Service, Academic Advisement, or a Non-Teaching Primary Job Assignment. Recommendation regarding merit may be reviewed through the grievance procedure beginning at Step 1 and ending after the Provost's level. The arbitration article shall not apply to merit grievances.

Four-Year Colleges and Universities Referring to Peer Review, but Lacking Detailed Language on Procedures:

Dowling College, NY
Eastern Washington University, WA
Florida State University System, FL
Northern Montana College, MT
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, PA
Portland State University, Full Time, OR
Roger Williams University, RI
Temple University, PA
University of California, Faculty, CA
University of Detroit, Mercy, MI\
University of Maine System, Faculty, ME
University of Minnesota, Duluth, MN
University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE
University of Rhode Island, Faculty, RI
Utica College, NY

Search Criteria:

"Peer review" OR
"Peer" within 25 words of any of these:
eval*
assess*
apprais*

Mentoring Language in Higher Education Contracts

NEA's Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS)

May 1997

Mentoring in Higher Education Contracts
Patterns and Sample Language from HECAS 96

The primary patterns found in contract language concerning mentoring include:

- **Abstract statements that faculty assignments may include mentoring of colleagues or students:**

Many contracts include brief references to mentoring as one of many faculty responsibilities or recommend mentoring for new faculty. These contracts are not explicit about the nature of mentoring, or how mentors or those being mentored are selected. They may specify some workload equivalencies.

California State University, CA (CA082.TXT)

---

c. The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member's field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. ***Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform.***

Tacoma Community College, Faculty, WA (WA034.TXT)

6.22 Job Responsibilities
(a) Instructional Academic Employees - An instructional academic employee is a full-time academic employee whose primary professional responsibilities involve performing an instructional assignment. This assignment includes all of those activities which are necessary to complete this process. Activities which are an integral part of the instructional academic employee's work load may include the following: advising and counseling of students; committee work; preparation of teaching/learning activities; reading and grading of papers and tests; minor curriculum revision and course development; keeping abreast of literature within the area of competence; attendance at department, division and general faculty meetings (department meetings generally limited to ten (10) hours, except that if extenuating circumstances exist, an additional five (5) hours per quarter may be utilized); helping students with class-related questions and other instructional-related activities. ***Tenured faculty serve as mentors for associate faculty,*** provide leadership in college strategic planning and curriculum development, serve on tenure committees, and may serve as department Chairpersons.

Yakima Valley College, WA (WA044.TXT)

---

8. Up to five (5) "instructional units" shall be granted to any academic employee who is assigned to serve as a mentor during a quarter for another academic employee, whether full- or part-time. The number of units granted, the nature of the activities, the method of evaluation, and the frequency of reporting shall be determined by agreement between the proposed mentor and the appropriate supervising administrator.

- **Specific programs for experienced faculty to serve as mentors to pre-tenure or probationary faculty, part-time or adjunct faculty, or graduate teaching assistants:**

The majority of contracts addressing formal mentoring requirements or programs are concerned with mentoring of probationary or pre-tenure faculty. The contract provisions generally specify the process or criteria for selection of mentors, workload credit for mentoring, the nature of the mentor-mentee relationship, and the nature of the connection between evaluation for tenure or continuing contract status and the mentoring process.

Hillsborough Community College, FL (FL019.TXT)

(Definitions) 2.17 - Mentor A tenured faculty member who has successfully completed the mentoring workshop and who is selected to provide guidance to first and/or second year tenure track faculty.

G. MENTORS
A mentoring program will be established in which a first- or second-year faculty member will be assigned a mentor.
1. Mentoring Workshop
Beginning with the academic year 1995-96, the College and FUSA will jointly present mentoring workshops to be conducted during the Fall Term 1995-96 and during the Spring Term thereafter. FUSA will invite tenured faculty to volunteer to attend the workshop. The volunteers will be asked to attend one workshop during which the role of a mentor and effective mentoring techniques will be discussed and appropriate documents will be provided. Professional leave may be granted and substitutes provided for faculty having other scheduled College activities during the workshop. Only those faculty who have attended a workshop will be eligible for mentorship.
2. Selection of a Mentor
The College will provide the Dean of those disciplines and those campuses to which first- and/or second-year faculty have been assigned with a list of the peer mentors who have attended a workshop. From that list the Dean and the first- and/or second-year faculty will select a peer mentor who is mutually acceptable to the parties. The mentor and the faculty member will be members of the same cluster and, when possible, from the same discipline and campus.
3. Appointment of a Mentor
The Dean will notify the prospective peer mentor of his selection and upon his acceptance of the position, a product contract will be issued to the mentor for $150 for that term's mentoring activities. The participating peer mentor will not be requested to provide mentoring assistance to more than one faculty member in any given term. Payment for mentoring activities will be initiated by the Dean upon the receipt of the mentor's checklist to be submitted with the mentor's grades at the conclusion of the Fall Term. Even though a peer mentor's official duties will conclude with the Fall Term, he will remain a resource person for the new faculty member during the Spring Term on an as-needed basis.
4. Mentor's Responsibilities
a. The mentor's responsibilities are as designated in the mutually agreed upon Checklist of mentor activities.
b. The mentor will observe the faculty member's class at least twice during the Fall Terms of the

compensation under clause 1004.

Southeastern Community College, IA (IA037.TXT)

6. Each probationary employee will meet with his/her immediate supervisor prior to the third week of the probationary employee's first semester to select a team of three peers who will be asked to serve as a mentoring team. Selection may be made on an institution- wide basis, including retired staff. The ***mentoring team*** will meet with the probationary faculty member a minimum of three times during each of the first two semesters or sessions of employment. During the second year of probationary status, the mentoring team shall meet a minimum of two times each semester or session. The mentoring team shall provide a progress report to the immediate supervisor, the Dean of Instruction, and the Personnel Officer. ***The evaluation of probationary faculty will exclude input from mentoring team members.***

Sonoma County Junior College District, CA (CA079.TXT)

4 . ***Any mentoring of probationary faculty, while of potentially great value to probationary faculty, must remain entirely separate from the official Tenure Review process.***

- **Assignment of a mentor to faculty with poor classroom evaluations.**

A few contracts address special programs for faculty who have received poor evaluations for classroom instruction:

TEAM TEACHING*
Team teaching may be justified for a number of pedagogical reasons, consistent with academic and productivity goals of the University. 1. More specifically, team teaching may be justified when: a. The course is intended to integrate different perspectives and disciplinary expertise of more than one faculty member; b. Team teaching of the course is integral to curricular objectives of the Program and University (***for example when one of the faculty involved needs significant mentoring to effectively teach the course***);

Coast Community College District, Faculty/AP, CA (CA076.TXT)

(e) Evaluation Conference. The panel shall meet with the evaluates to review the evaluation materials, to discuss proposed recommendations ***and to give any preliminary suggestions for professional development including mentoring.***

(h) Continued Evaluation. If a Faculty Member is recommended for continued evaluation, the panel will be retained for this purpose. The panel will work with the Faculty Member for the semester following the one in which the rating was assigned. The panel will assist the evaluates in improving in areas that led to the finding of continued evaluation, ***or recommend a mentoring process.*** The panel will submit a new evaluation report and recommendation to the Vice President of Instruction or Student Services, as appropriate, by the date of the appropriate semester as specified in subsection (g) of this Section. In response to the report, the evaluates may submit to the Vice President a written, signed statement which will be attached to the report. The Vice President , after reviewing the new evaluation report and recommendation with the panel, will change the rating to satisfactory, or in the event the panel again finds the evaluatee's performance unsatisfactory, an augmented evaluation will be initiated.

Southwestern Community College, IA (IA036.TXT)

If remediation is deemed necessary a remediation plan will be developed. ***The instructor may select a mentor from instructional staff to assist in development of the plan*** (time frames must be specified). The remediation plan will be discussed in conference with the Vice President of Instruction, the immediate supervisor (if different from the Vice President of Instruction), and the instructor. The plan, as approved by the Vice President of Instruction, shall be identified in writing and will cover not less than one semester or more than one year. ***The role of the mentor will be to assist in development of the plan: he/she will not be involved in the evaluation.*** Every effort will be made to assist the instructor to meet his/her goals. A conference between the employee and the supervisor will be held at the culmination of the plan to assess the outcome.

3.4.4 Minority Recruitment and Retention Funds Funding for this program shall be 0.013 times the biweekly payroll for that pay period including April 15 of the prior fiscal year, continuing annually thereafter. Unexpended funds appropriated pursuant to this Article shall carry forward from year to year and be available for expenditure for these purposes until exhausted.
Funds may be used for any incidental expenses directly related to these purposes as recommended by the Minority Recruitment and Retention Committee. Such funds may not be used for any salary payment for the mentor, the committee, or related personnel. Distribution of funds shall be made to each campus in proportion to campus membership.

One contract provides for special consideration of the demand for women and minorities to serve as mentors to students and peers:

Wayne State University, MI (MI073.TXT)

The Association and the Administration both recognize the extraordinary demands placed on women and minority bargaining unit members as ***mentors to students*** and as representatives to various university, college and unit committees. In order that such service does not adversely affect the careers of women and minority bargaining unit members, the University agrees to establish the following competitive grant program. The University shall make available a pool of $50,000 each year for the purpose of allowing released-time from teaching for minority faculty bargaining unit members and women faculty bargaining unit members in units where females have been traditionally under-represented. Untenured, tenure-track women faculty from such units and minority faculty bargaining unit members will be eligible to compete in this program under guidelines established by the President or his/her designee. Any unexpended balances of funds for this program will be carried over to the next year

Text of Contract Language on Mentoring Programs

II. Tenure Committees
A. Candidate's Tenure Committee 1. Each tenure-track faculty member shall have his/her own Candidate's Tenure Committee until such time as the department votes to grant or deny tenure.
2. The committee, when possible, shall have three voting members who are tenured faculty members of the department. A chair shall be selected by the candidate who shall also serve as the candidate's mentor for one year. Two members shall be elected by the tenured and tenure-track members of the candidate's curriculum unit or department.
3. The mentor shall guide the candidate in the following aspects:
-Teaching methodologies
-Testing and grading
-Developing course outlines and syllabi
-Developing overheads and support material
- Utilizing copiers and computers
-Advising
-Following campus policies and procedures
4. The mentor shall visit each of the candidate's classes a minimum of once each quarter.
5. The mentor shall provide a critique and interview with the candidate in a private setting immediately following each visit.

Connecticut State University System, CT (CT001.TXT)

3.4.2 The committee shall be charged with the responsibility of assisting search committees to recruit members of minorities and other protected groups; to assist the university in retaining such members; and to engage in such other actions as will effectuate the above purposes including the possibility of travel, mentoring, support for obtaining appropriate credentials, etc. When mentoring is arranged and if the committee so recommends, a mentor may be provided one (1) load credit per semester for this purpose. During the life of this Agreement, no campus committee may recommend more than one (1) load credit per one-hundred (100) full-time members or fraction thereof during any semester.

Connecticut State University System, CT (CT001.TXT)

3.4.4 Minority Recruitment and Retention Funds Funding for this program shall be 0.013 times the biweekly payroll for that pay period including April 15 of the prior fiscal year, continuing annually thereafter. Unexpended funds appropriated pursuant to this Article shall carry forward from year to year and be available for expenditure for these purposes until exhausted.
Funds may be used for any incidental expenses directly related to these purposes as recommended by the Minority Recruitment and Retention Committee. Such funds may not be used for any salary payment for the mentor, the committee, or related personnel. Distribution of funds shall be made to each campus in proportion to campus membership.

California State University, CA (CA082.TXT)

c. The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member's field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform.

Pennsylvania State System, APSCUF, PA (PA027.TXT)

Eastern Michigan University, MI (MI097.TXT)

603 1. Teach Graduate Courses.
604 2. Maintain standards of student performance associated with graduate education.
605 3. Participate as a dissertation or thesis committee member.
606 4. Serve as a mentor for student research/creative activities.

University of Montana, MT (MT014.TXT)

equivalencies. These guidelines for reassignments and credit-hour equivalencies shall take account of student need for required courses; extraordinary research/creative activities and professional service; and the contact-hour demands of studio and laboratory courses, independent studies, supervision of internships and student teaching, courses designated as "W" (writing intensive), large enrollment courses with or without the aid of teaching assistants and/or graders, graduate student mentoring, extraordinary advising duties, and developing and teaching courses delivered through telecommunications to multiple sites. Independent of these guidelines, faculty members may seek

Wayne State University, MI (MI073.TXT)

The Association and the Administration both recognize the extraordinary demands placed on women and minority bargaining unit members as mentors to students and as representatives to various university, college and unit committees. In order that such service does not adversely affect the careers of women and minority bargaining unit members, the University agrees to establish the following competitive grant program.
The University shall make available a pool of $50,000 each year for the purpose of allowing released-time from teaching for minority faculty bargaining unit members and women faculty bargaining unit members in units where females have been traditionally under-represented. Untenured, tenure-track women faculty from such units and minority faculty bargaining unit members will be eligible to compete in this program under guidelines established by the President or his/her designee. Any unexpended balances of funds for this program will be carried over to the next year.

Victor Valley Community College, CA (CA078.TXT)

7.6.3.1 Career Plan
The opportunity will be provided to all permanent classified employees to identify their career goal at Victor Valley College.
The employee, in cooperation with his/her supervisor, the Office of Human Resources representatives, and/or counselors, will formulate a plan for reaching his/her career goal at Victor Valley College. The plan is to specifically define coursework, degrees, job shadowing opportunities and mentoring opportunities, which will prepare the employee for his/her career goal. A copy of the career plan is to be provided to the employee's supervisor, the appropriate Vice President and to the Office of Human Resources. Where necessary, the plan is to be updated or revised to reflect career goal changes. The official career goal plan is to be retained in the Office of Human Resources.

7.6.3.5 Mentoring
The District will establish a pool of mentors from which classified employees will be encouraged to select a mentor to help guide and fortify his/her career development at Victor Valley College.

be discussed and appropriate documents will be provided. Professional leave may be granted and substitutes provided for faculty having other scheduled College activities during the workshop. Only those faculty who have attended a workshop will be eligible for mentorship.

2. Selection of a Mentor

The College will provide the Dean of those disciplines and those campuses to which first- and/or second-year faculty have been assigned with a list of the peer mentors who have attended a workshop. From that list the Dean and the first- and/or second-year faculty will select a peer mentor who is mutually acceptable to the parties. The mentor and the faculty member will be members of the same cluster and, when possible, from the same discipline and campus.

3. Appointment of a Mentor

The Dean will notify the prospective peer mentor of his selection and upon his acceptance of the position, a product contract will be issued to the mentor for $150 for that term's mentoring activities. The participating peer mentor will not be requested to provide mentoring assistance to more than one faculty member in any given term. Payment for mentoring activities will be initiated by the Dean upon the receipt of the mentor's checklist to be submitted with the mentor's grades at the conclusion of the Fall Term. Even though a peer mentor's official duties will conclude with the Fall Term, he will remain a resource person for the new faculty member during the Spring Term on an as-needed basis.

4. Mentor's Responsibilities

a. The mentor's responsibilities are as designated in the mutually agreed upon Checklist of mentor activities.

b. The mentor will observe the faculty member's class at least twice during the Fall Terms of the first and second year of service. In a post observation conference, the mentor will meet with the faculty member to discuss the classroom activities and to offer support in meeting the faculty member's needs.

c. The Program Manager will participate in the process by attending a workshop and by observing the faculty member's class at least one time during the Fall Term. In a post observation conference, the Program Manager will meet with the faculty member to discuss the classroom activities and to offer support in meeting the faculty member's needs.

d. During those Fall Terms when a faculty member is being mentored, the Dean's evaluation specified in Article 9.4 may be waived. The Dean will evaluate the faculty member during the Spring Terms of the first and second year of service and during the Fall and Spring Terms of the third year of service as specified in Article 9.

Los Angeles Community College System, CA (CA025.TXT)

---

(2)The department shall appoint a regular faculty member not on the evaluation committee to mentor the contract employee during his/her probationary period. Once during this period and without prejudice, either the mentor or the evaluee may choose to terminate the mentoring relationship. In such a case, the depart- ment in consultation with the evaluee shall select a new mentor from among the regular faculty. The requirement for having a mentor shall be waived upon mutual agreement by the college administration, the department, and the evaluee.

---

d.Disposition of Forms; Additional Evaluations

If all sections of the Administrative Performance Reports are marked "Satisfactory", all Student Evaluation Forms used in the evaluation shall be returned to the person being evaluated upon submission of the evaluee's final grades or upon conclusion of the evaluation process for non-classroom employees, and Probationary Instructor Evaluation Forms shall be destroyed by the Vice President in the presence of the evaluee. However, in an evaluation involving granting of tenure all forms shall be retained until the Board of Trustees has acted on the tenure request. If one or more sections are marked "Needs to Improve @ or "Unsatisfactory", all evaluation forms shall be retained by the Vice President until such time that the person has again been evaluated and all sections are marked "Satisfactory". in such a case, additional evaluations shall be

No other openers are authorized except by mutual agreement.

Brookdale Community College, Faculty, NJ (NJ051.TXT)

APPENDIX 4
BROOKDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

NON-TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS
YEAR ONE
Each non-tenured faculty member will be assigned a mentor, usually a tenured member of the department. The mentor will
Support the new faculty member and consult frequently with the Department Chair and Division Chairperson regarding the progress of the new person.
Evidence of evaluation will include:
1. Peer review: Members of the department will be Polled by the Division Chairperson regarding the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the new person.
2. Classroom observation by the Division Chairperson will occur in a minimum of three classes during the first teaching year. For mid- year appointments, Classroom observation will occur in at least one class in the winter term.
3. Student evaluations will be administered by a member of the department in a minimum of three classes in each of the long terms. Results will be incorporated Into the Faculty Evaluation Form.
4. Division Chair Evaluation
Evaluation #1 -. The Division Chairperson will submit the written
evaluation to the Vice President for Educational Services by February 1. (For mid-year appointments; evaluations should be submitted by March 1.) The evaluation will include the following:
a. faculty Evaluation Report (PE-47) b. Personal Performance objectives (PE-48) C. Faculty Response Form (PE_ 14)
Evaluation #2 (for Fall appointments only) - Due to the Vice President for Educational Services by June 1. The evaluation will include the following:
a. Faculty Evaluation Report (PE-47) b. Personal Performance Objectives (PE-48) c. Faculty Response Form (PE-14)

NON-TENURED FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESS
YEAR TWO
The mentor will continue if the mentor, Department Chairperson and Division Chairperson agree the arrangement should be maintained.
Evidence of evaluation will include:
1. Peer review: Members of the department will be polled by the Division Chairperson regarding the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the new person.
2. Classroom observation by the Division Chairperson will occur in a minimum of three classes during the second teaching year.
3. Student evaluations will be administered by a member of the department in a minimum of three classes in each of the long terms. Results will be incorporated into the Faculty Evaluation Form.
4. Self-evaluation (due with evaluation #2 only): The individual will be asked to summarize his/her reaction in writing to the first two years at Brookdale. The evaluation will include:
A. Curriculum Development - summarize work to include:
1. New Courses 2. Course revisions 3. Special projects 4. Non-print materials 5. Supplemental print materials
B. College Service (include whether the activity was for compensation or voluntary)
1. Committee work 2. Grant activity 3. Clubs 4. Academic leadership
C. Professional Growth
1. Publications 2. Conferences/workshops attended (dates and places) 3. Exhibits (dates and places) 4. Memberships (dates and Places) 5. Other professional activities not included above

3. Student evaluations will be administered by a member of the department in a minimum of three classes in each of the long terms. Results will be incorporated into the Faculty Evaluation Form.
4. Self-evaluation (due with evaluation #2 only): The individual will be asked to summarize his/her reaction in writing to the first four years at Brookdale. The evaluation will include:
A. Curriculum Development- summarize work to include:
1. New courses 2. Course revisions 3: Special projects 4
Non-print materials S. Supplemental print materials
B. College Service (include whether the activity was for compensation or voluntary)
1. Committee work 2. Grant activity 3. Clubs 4. Academic leadership
C. Professional Growth
1. Publications 2. Conferences/workshops attended (dates and places) 3. Exhibitions (dates and places) 4. Memberships 5. Other professional activities not included above
D. Community Service
List those activities that bear a direct relationship to your Position at Brookdale, i.e., speaking engagements, involvement with outside organizations, institutions and agencies.
Division Chair Evaluation
Evaluation #1 - The Division Chairperson will submit the written evaluation to the Vice President for Educational Services by February 1. The evaluation will include the following:
a. Faculty Evaluation Report (PE-47) b. Personal Performance Objectives (PE-48) and summary of departmental peer review c. Faculty Response Report (PE-14)
Evaluation #2 - Due to the Vice President for Educational Services by June 1. The evaluation will include:
a. Faculty Evaluation Report (PE-47) b. Personal Performance Objectives (PE-48) c. Faculty Response Report (PE-14) d. Self-evaluation from employee e. The evaluation process will include a meeting of the non-tenured faculty member and the Division Chairperson with the Vice President for Educational Services and the President. This meeting should be held before April 30.

YEAR FIVE
The mentor will continue if the mentor, Department Chairperson and Division Chairperson agree the arrangement should be maintained. Evidence of evaluation will include:
1. Peer review: The department will review the contributions of the individual to the department and make a collective judgment whether tenure (and automatic promotion if the individual is an instructor) is warranted. This recommendation will be in written form and the department chairperson will summarize the department's recommendation In a written narrative recommendation to the Division Chairperson detailing the individual's specific worth to the department.
2. Classroom observation by the Division Chairperson will occur in a minimum of three classes during the fifth teaching year.
3. Student evaluations will be administered by a member of the department in a minimum of three classes in each of the long terms. Results will be incorporated into the Faculty Evaluation Form.
4. Self-evaluation (due with evaluation 12 only) - The individual will be asked to summarize his/her reaction in writing their five years at Brookdale. The evaluation will include:
A. Curriculum Development - summarize work to include:
1. New courses 2. Course revisions 3. Special projects 4. Non-print materials S. Supplemental print materials
B. College Service (include whether the activity was for compensation or voluntary)
1. Committee work 2. Grant activity 3. Clubs 4. Academic leadership
C. Professional Growth
1. Publications 2. Conferences/workshops attended (dates and places) 3. Exhibitions (dates and places) 4. Memberships 5. Other professional activities not included in above
D. Community Service
List those activities that bear a direct relationship to your Position at Brookdale, i.e., speaking engagements, involvement with outside organizations, institutions and agencies.

process. The panel will submit a new evaluation report and recommendation to the Vice President of Instruction or Student Services, as appropriate, by the date of the appropriate semester as specified in subsection (g) of this Section. In response to the report, the evaluates may submit to the Vice President a written, signed statement which will be attached to the report.
The Vice President , after reviewing the new evaluation report and recommendation with the panel, will change the rating to satisfactory, or in the event the panel again finds the evaluatee's performance unsatisfactory, an augmented evaluation will be initiated.

Section 18. Mentors
Faculty serving as faculty mentors to Faculty Interns under the Los Angeles/Orange County Partnering for Diversity Consortium, shall be compensated at $600 per mentor.

Edison State Community College, OH (OH032.TXT)

---

e. See that adjuncts are assigned mentors, as required;
coordinate the work of mentors; and handle problems as they arise, referring any serious problems to the associate dean.

---

g. Mentors; The mentoring program established in the Addendum #1
to the collective bargaining agreement shall be discontinued, and mentoring duties will be accomplished in the manner they have traditionally been accomplished prior to the program's inception.

William Rainey Harper Community College, Faculty, IL (IL027.TXT)

L. Mentors
Each semester, full-time faculty members will recommend to appropriate administrators the faculty members to be appointed as mentors for adjunct faculty members serving in their first or second semester on the staff. The mentors will guide and assist the adjunct faculty members as prescribed by the appropriate administrators. The mentors will receive a stipend of one hundred dollars ($100) for each adjunct faculty member to whom they are assigned who are teaching at the College for the first semester and fifty dollars ($50) for each adjunct faculty member teaching in his/her second semester.
Nothing herein shall require the appointment of a mentor in each instance.

Alpena Community College, MI (MI082.TXT)

---

9. Mentor Instructors
Mentor instructors may be assigned to all on-campus newly hired part-time or full-time instructors. The mentor instructor will be assigned a minimum of 8 and a maximum of 32 clock hours a semester. A bargaining unit member may refuse this assignment.

---

5. Summer Orientation, Enrichment Programs, Internship Supervisors and Mentor Instructors.
Instructors who work in the summer orientation and/or enrichment programs will be paid the following hourly rates:
Step Hourly Rate
1 $13.81
2 14.37

a. participating on a college committee, Academic Senate committee, Faculty Association committee, or task force;
b. participating in peer review (hiring committees, tenure evaluation, biannual evaluation of hourly faculty);
c. mentoring new faculty.

Tacoma Community College, Faculty, WA (WA034.TXT)

6.22 Job Responsibilities
(a) Instructional Academic Employees - An instructional academic employee is a full-time academic employee whose primary professional responsibilities involve performing an instructional assignment. This assignment includes all of those activities which are necessary to complete this process. Activities which are an integral part of the instructional academic employee's work load may include the following: advising and counseling of students; committee work; preparation of teaching/learning activities; reading and grading of papers and tests; minor curriculum revision and course development; keeping abreast of literature within the area of competence; attendance at department, division and general faculty meetings (department meetings generally limited to ten (10) hours, except that if extenuating circumstances exist, an additional five (5) hours per quarter may be utilized); helping students with class-related questions and other instructional-related activities. Tenured faculty serve as mentors for associate faculty, provide leadership in college strategic planning and curriculum development, serve on tenure committees, and may serve as department Chairpersons.

(b) Mentoring - The mentoring of a new academic employees by tenured faculty, as prescribed by the Union-Management Committee developed mentoring program, will convert to PAU's at the rate of 1 PAU per quarter served.

College of the Redwoods, CA (CA062.TXT)

III. PHASE II
A. PHASE II TEAM AND ACTIVITIES The Phase 11 evaluation team will be comprised of the division chairperson', appropriate dean, and both of the Phase I peer evaluators. The Evaluatee in Phase II will meet with this team to discuss the evaluation and areas of concern that exist. Specific written recommendations and a timeline for improvement will be developed. Phase 11 activities may include but are not limited to: gathering additional evaluations, approving lesson plans, appointing a mentor, requiring psychological and/or medical counseling, requiring additional course work. The recommendations will include a schedule of subsequent meetings to determine compliance and progress.

ARTICLE XII IN-SERVICE TRAINING
12.1 In order to provide time for mentoring and staff development for new employees, all full- time tenure-track employees shall receive 1.5-4.5 TLU's of reassigned time during their first semester of employment. The purpose of this reassigned time is to allow participation in in-service training programs. The exact amount of reassigned time for, and type of, in-service training will be determined by the administration in consultation with the mentor and the employee and will depend upon the individual's schedule variables. In addition, new first time faculty will not normally carry overload schedules and shall be excused from student advising and committee assignments. Administrators reassigned as faculty will not normally be provided reassigned time for in-service training, but exceptions may be approved by the President.

Fox Valley Technical College, Faculty/AP, WI (WI055.TXT)

Contract faculty may challenge the committee make-up by requesting a change of one member on the committee. The replacement member to the committee will be appointed by the same body that chose the original committee member. Additionally, either the contract faculty member or that member's division may request the selection of a committee member from the District's other college. In order to select the optional fourth member of the committee, the level-one tenure review committee and the contract faculty member must reach mutual consent. Also, by mutual consent the level-one tenure review committee will remain the same for the entire four years of contractual employment.
One of the two faculty members on the committee may serve as a mentor to the contract faculty member.

Lower Columbia College, WA (WA029.TXT)

Part of each academic employee's workload is in areas that serve the college in a non-teaching capacity. This service is beyond that listed in 701.3. Various combinations of the following, or others as mutual agreed, will be assigned by the appropriate associate dean after consultation with the academic employee:
A. Committee assignments as appointed by the President of the college, Dean for Instruction, appropriate Associate Dean, or the instructional department.
B. Advising and/or mentoring as assigned by the department chair or Associate Dean for Enrollment Management.

812.1 Professional Partner
As defined in 811 above one partner is assigned to an inexperienced, part-time academic employee for the first and two successive reappointments. The partner assists in all matters pertaining to college and departmental policies and procedures, acts as the source of professional assistance and serves as a mentor for the three periods of appointment. The professional partner will receive a stipend for each quarter as a partner.
812.2 Professional Partner Duties
A. First Quarter Appointment. Meet with professional partner coordinator and the employee to set up evaluation procedures.
Assist employee in becoming familiar with campus policy, departmental procedures and services offered. Do a classroom visitation. Review outcomes of evaluations with the employee as required or requested to assist employee in improving teaching effectiveness.
B. First Reappointment. Continues to act as mentor for the employee and assists as needed, including a review of student evaluations, course syllabi, course information sheets, student evaluation techniques and additional classroom visitations if requested or needed.
C. Second Reappointment. Conduct additional evaluations, including peer and self-assessments, and identify ways the department may assist in maintaining or improving employee's academic effectiveness. This information will be shared with the part-time academic employee during a conference between the professional partner and part-time academic employee. Following the conference, the professional partner will present a written report of The outcomes of the conference, a summary of student evaluations, and raw data used as a basis for the report to the department chair for the department review.
812.3 Request for a Change in Professional Partners
If after one quarter, the part-time academic employee wishes, the part-time academic employee may request that the professional partner program coordinator appoint a different professional partner for the remaining quarters of the professional partner program.
813 Student Evaluation
The part-time employee will have students evaluate teaching to help measure effectiveness.
813.1 Frequency
During each quarter that the part-time academic employee is appointed to a teaching position, student evaluations will be requested for each class taught.

7.3 Mentoring Program for new faculty: Mentor of new faculty member = 1 unit (New faculty member = 4 units of work load during the first teaching year.)

Lakeshore Technical College, WI (WI037.TXT)

A joint endorsement by management and LEA should clarify the purpose of the professional orientation period and explain the process as evaluative not disciplinary. To begin, we will evaluate the current practice of each new teacher in-service. We will state responsibilities for assisting new faculty members and provide training for managers to assist and mentor the new teacher. We will also have some retired teachers act as mentors. Staff development must be a high priority during the professional orientation period. A plan of development and evaluation is to be completed by the end of the first year. The plan of improvement is then implemented during the second year. The completion of the second year of successful teaching will end the professional orientation period. The new faculty member will earn a certificate of completion, and the college will celebrate.

Chemeketa Community College, OR (OR041.TXT)

A. CTV Classes:
I .Develop guidelines in collaboration with receive sites for monitoring and support expectations. Support systems must be standardized to a certain level to provide appropriate support for multiple site delivery. (Some learning methodologies may require support beyond that which can be reasonably required at sites and therefore may not be appropriate for CTV delivery.)
2. Increase differential at same rate as regular salary increase. [1996-97, $87.63; 1997-98, $90.04.]
3. Special circumstances (e.g. unusual requirements of course) may require flexibility in negotiating appropriate support and compensation. This should be dealt with by a conversation between the director and faculty member, involving others (dean, association, etc.) as needed.
4. Develop "Distance Delivery Instructional Handbook."
5. Develop mentoring/teaching process (e.g., manual/video) for faculty learning new teaching modalities.

Yakima Valley College, WA (WA044.TXT)

---

8. Up to five (5) "instructional units" shall be granted to any academic employee who is assigned to serve as a mentor during a quarter for another academic employee, whether full- or part-time. The number of units granted, the nature of the activities, the method of evaluation, and the frequency of reporting shall be determined by agreement between the proposed mentor and the appropriate supervising administrator.

Parkland Community Collge, Faculty/AP, IL (IL070.TXT)

(i) other activities as agreed upon by the department chair and the Vice President for Academic and Student Services with the faculty member, and
student evaluations at eight weeks for all new faculty during their first semester at the College and participation in the mentor process for new faculty.

---

5. Consideration of one or more of the following professional growth components is encouraged, but optional. These activities may be suggested by the department chair, the evaluator, or the faculty member being evaluated, but they must be mutually acceptable before they are instituted in the evaluation plan:
August 1994

(a) planning professional development activities,

Transfer center program 8. Mentoring program 9. Other activities designated by the campus president

North Central Technical College, WI (WI034.TXT)

H. Probation, Nonrenewal, and Discipline
1. Members of the faculty employed by the District shall be considered on probationary employment status for the duration of the first three years from date of employment. During that period faculty will be supported through a required, formal orientation and peer mentoring program.

Cuyahoga Community College, OH (OH012.TXT)

D. College Service: includes participation in college governance, faculty development, general committee involvement, curriculum review, evaluation and revision, and mentoring of full-time and part-time faculty.

McHenry County Community College, IL (IL045.TXT)

A. In Class Performance
1. Agreement on the Problem
a. Develop a Remediation Plan to address such items as:
i. Changes to be made; ii. Suggested methods for accomplishing the changes to be made include: a. use of mentors; b. peer observations; C. video-taping presentations; d. college conferences; e. administrative observation; f. third party observation g. staff development assistance; and h. additional formal study; iii. Establishment of a timetable for changes to be made; iv. An explanation of the importance of accomplishing all of the changes to be made stressing that failure to accomplish these goals may result in a Board issued Notice to Remedy; and V. A commitment by the administrator to make every effort possible to support the changes to be made.

Elgin Community College, IL (IL085.TXT)

Participate in faculty staffing process
1) Recruit part-time applicants 2) Review part-time applications 3) Interview prospective part-time faculty 4) Recommend part-time staff for hiring 5) Recommend assignment of faculty supervisor 6) Justify need for new full-time faculty 7) Participate on search committees for new full-time faculty within their assignment 8) Mentor new full-time faculty

Monroe Community College, NY (NY038.TXT)

2. Actively participates in department, program, division, and College activities (e.g., attends meetings, holds office, is involved in Faculty Association, is involved in committee work, mentor ship, and/or equivalent activities).

Henry Ford Community College, MI (MI063.TXT)

A department/division shall establish a Probationary Teacher Mentor Committee consisting of tenured teachers of the department/division to provide the probationary teacher with: (1) evaluation(s) and recommendations regarding the teacher's performance during the teacher's first two years of probation and (2) information regarding procedures and policies of the department/division and the College, with particular emphasis upon the shared governance structure of the College. The findings and recommendations of such a committee shall be

professionally to a point where he/she has mastered both a particular field of knowledge and the teaching of that knowledge. A successful candidate must show evidence that he/she consistently has sought to meet student needs, in both the classroom and non-classroom environments. A Professor should be a senior member of the faculty, one who has such substantial experience, knowledge, and skill that he/she could mentor junior faculty in his/her area of expertise. A Professor will have demonstrated all the same kinds of achievements and attributes necessary for promotion to the Associate Professor rank, but in addition will demonstrate that he/she is a leader in some appropriate sense. Evidence of professional growth and leadership will be drawn from a careful analysis of student evaluations and peer evaluations over a period of time, and from a critical reading of materials submitted by the candidate.

Edmonds Community College, WA (WA032.TXT)

7.5.3 Senior faculty shall choose to serve the district by working internally as a mentor to other faculty, working externally with the public schools and/or other agencies or institutions or by working in an assignment mutually agreed to by the employee and the Employer.

Faculty Mentoring

Custom Bibliography for the National Education Association

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

May 1997

139

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
Institute for Educational Policy Studies
Graduate School of Education and Human Development
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Custom Bibliography for the National Education Association
Topic: Faculty Mentoring

April 21, 1997

1 User-Defined Format
EJ526202 FL525896
Faculty Assessment and Development in a Changing Profession.
Berry, Alice
ADFL Bulletin, v27 n3 p54-57 Spr 1996
Special issue: Graduate Education and Undergraduate Teaching: Juncture and Disjuncture.
Available From: UMI
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Examines college faculty development issues. The article discusses mechanisms for socializing faculty members to the dual model of teacher-scholar. These mechanisms include annual merit review, orientation of junior faculty members, mentoring, monetary awards, and a teaching colloquium. Systematic training of faculty prepares them for future instructional technology. (four references) (CK)

2 User-Defined Format
EJ523034 HE535169
A Comprehensive Approach to Orientation and Mentoring for New Faculty.
Keating, Daniel
Journal of Legal Education, v46 n1 p59-66 Mar 1996
Available From: UMI
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
A Washington University (Missouri) law school program for new faculty has four elements: a publication, "Things I Wish I Had Known as a New Faculty Member"; orientation sessions on teaching, creating and grading exams, pursuing scholarship, and dealing with law reviews; formal mentoring; and a detailed question-and-answer memo about the tenure process to supplement the formal tenure document. (MSE)

3 User-Defined Format
EJ524696 HE535381
Involving Peers in the Evaluation and Improvement of Teaching: A Menu of Strategies.
Quinlan, Kathleen M.
Innovative Higher Education, v20 n4 p299-307 Sum 1996
Theme issue topic: "Peer Review of Teaching."
Available From: UMI
Document Type: NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Approaches to college faculty peer coaching and peer review are described, including team mentoring, reciprocal class visits, teaching circles, departmental teaching libraries, teaching portfolios, course portfolios, pedagogical colloquia, and departmental reviews. Methods can be adapted, combined for different goals, contexts. All rest on faculty assumption of responsibility for the process and a view of teaching as substantive and scholarly. (MSE)

4 User-Defined Format
ED388334 JC950517
Iowa Community College Induction/Mentoring (CCIM) Program.
Booth, Connie; And Others
May 1995
20p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development on Teaching Excellence and Conference of Administrators (17th, Austin, TX, May 21-24, 1995).
EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); CONFERENCE PAPER (150)
To help ensure that new vocational faculty receive adequate training to teach an increasingly wide range of nontraditional students, Iowa State University (ISU)

established the Community College Induction/Mentoring (CCIM) program in 1992. Over 2 academic years, program participants take 14 sequentially designed seminars providing instruction in 43 effective teaching behaviors, while instruction is carried out by teams of the new instructor, a mentor assigned by the new instructor's home institution, and an ISU instructor. Each seminar is offered at a central location, and enrollment is limited to 30 students. Mentors attend a one-day training program at ISU and are employed to help the beginning instructor's competence, confidence, self-direction, and professionalism. The CCIM is evaluated through surveys of participants, mentors, participants' immediate supervisors, students in participants' classes, and CCIM facilitators. In recent evaluations, program participants expressed a high level of satisfaction with their success in implementing teaching behaviors. Also, compared to instructors not enrolled in the program, CCIM participants were rated significantly higher by their students on 15 of 18 survey items related to instructor performance and effectiveness in the classroom. Although implementing the CCIM included overcoming an initial resistance to such a radical departure from traditional teacher education and gaining commitment from administrators, the program can be easily replicated wherever faculty training is needed. (The 43 effective teaching behaviors are appended.) (KP)

5 User-Defined Format
EJ505980 CE527965
Mentoring Revisited: The Hispanic Woman's Perspective.
Bova, Breda Murphy
Journal of Adult Education, v23 n1 p8-19 Spr 1995
Available From: UMI
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Interviews with 20 Hispanic female faculty and administrators revealed mentoring to be important to career development but difficult to obtain. Barriers included limited opportunities for informal contact, compounded stereotypes of women and of Hispanic women, and conflicting values of Hispanic and academic cultures. (SK)

6 User-Defined Format
EJ510206 HE534318
African American Female Faculty at Large Research Universities: Their Need for Information.
Bowie, Melvin W.
Innovative Higher Education, v19 n4 p269-76 Sum 1995
Available From: UMI
Document Type: POSITION PAPER (120); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
The minority label can be a barrier to the female African American faculty member's quest for full standing in a research university. To overcome this, they must find and use the best information available to help them, including finding a good mentor, mastering a variety of information sources, and building a strong personal and professional network. (Author/MSE)

7 User-Defined Format
EJ489645 HE532879
Research Mentoring in a Changing Environment: A Case Study.
Balint, M.; And Others
Higher Education Research and Development, v13 n1 p13-21 1994
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
An Australian faculty development program brought experienced and less experienced university research faculty together for research mentoring. A case study, written by all participants, views the program as a process of reflective inquiry with four stages: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. (Author/MSE)

8 User-Defined Format
EJ488161 HE532795
Mentoring Strategies for Faculty Development.
Harnish, Dorothy; Wild, Lynn A.
Studies in Higher Education, v19 n2 p191-201 1994
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Use of peer mentoring to improve college instruction and the concept of mutual mentoring are discussed, drawing on four faculty mentoring projects in which mentor faculty were paired with other teachers to develop new, alternative teaching methods/materials or gain new knowledge. Cross-disciplinary mentoring and mutual faculty benefits are examined. (MSE)

9 User-Defined Format
EJ492512 CG545693
A Formal Mentoring Program for Junior Female Faculty: Description and Evaluation.
Henry, Janice Schoen; And Others
Initiatives, v56 n2 p37-45 1994
Available From: UMI
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Describes formal mentoring program for junior female faculty implemented by Southern Illinois University at Carbondale because women face more career barriers than men and because mentoring shows promise as a contributor to career success. Describes Faculty Mentoring Program and includes section on program evaluation. (NB)

10 User-Defined Format
EJ489644 HE532878
Barriers to Success for Women in Academic Life: Perceptions of Participants in a Colleague Pairing Program.
Johnsrud, Linda K.; Wunsch, Marie A.
Higher Education Research and Development, v13 n1 p1-12 1994
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Junior women faculty (n=22) were paired with senior women colleagues as part of a mentoring initiative in a faculty development program. Participant perceptions before and after the program were analyzed for implications in three areas: roles and responsibilities, sense of fit, and personal security. (Author/MSE)

11 User-Defined Format
EJ492511 CG545692
Mentoring Women's Academic Careers: Using a Family Model to Enhance Women's Success.
Pistole, M. Carole
Initiatives, v56 n2 p29-36 1994
Available From: UMI
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Notes that, although they are qualified and are being hired into academic positions, women are not achieving tenure and promotion at same rate as men. Suggests that women's success can be affected by effective, purposeful mentoring and proposes framework that mentors can use to organize socialization and developmental process which women experience in entry-level academic positions. (NB)

12 User-Defined Format
EJ499936 JC506951
Faculty-to-Faculty Mentoring in the Community College: An Instructional Component of Faculty Development.
St. Clair, Karen L.
Community College Review, v22 n3 p23-35 Win 1994
Available From: UMI
Document Type: POSITION PAPER (120); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Discusses the importance of mentoring to faculty development programs, reviewing basic concepts, theories, and research related to mentoring. Indicates that faculty mentoring programs can provide ways for educators to understand diversity, learn about teaching techniques, and feel supported by other faculty members. Describes features of successful programs. (47 citations) (MAB)

13 User-Defined Format
EJ461463 HE531121
Early Turning Points in Professorial Careers of Women and Minorities.
Boice, Robert
New Directions for Teaching and Learning, n53 p71-79 Spr 1993
Theme Issue: Building a Diverse Faculty.
Available From: UMI
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
A study of 88 female and minority college faculty revealed that faculty who do not adapt well experience early career turning points, usually in the first semesters. Mentoring and social networks are found to be significant in adaptation. The simple nature of the turning points suggests strategies for avoiding such marginalization. (Author/MSE)

14 User-Defined Format
EJ466509 CG542818
Cross-Cultural Mentoring in Counselor Education: A Strategy for Retaining Minority Faculty.
Brinson, Jesse; Kottler, Jeffrey
Counselor Education and Supervision, v32 n4 p241-53 Jun 1993
Available From: UMI
Document Type: POSITION PAPER (120); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Discusses the advantages and challenges of cross-cultural mentoring relationships in counselor education, paying specific attention to the importance for minority junior faculty as well as for the profession. Contends that developing a relationship with a mentor is one way that minority faculty, once hired, can be helped to formulate realistic career goals and achieve professional success. (Author/NB)

15 User-Defined Format
ED361299 SP034679
Mentoring, Gender, and Careers of Academic Scientists.
Grant, Linda; And Others
16 Apr 1993
40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
EDRS Price - MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
Document Type: CONFERENCE PAPER (150); RESEARCH REPORT (143)
This study explores the dynamics and effects of mentoring relationships, with

particular emphasis on the experiences of women and minorities as proteges. It draws upon quantitative and qualitative data gathered from a survey of 587 academic scientists and interviews with 55 academic scientists, in 3 disciplinary areas: physics and astronomy, chemistry and biochemistry, and sociology. Results are analyzed in terms of effectiveness of mentors, access to eminent mentors, advantages and disadvantages of mentors, gender neutral themes, gender specific themes, problematic relationships, race/ethnicity-linked themes, collaboration, other mentors, and consequences of the mentoring experience. The study concludes that women and minority scientists, overall, appear to find the mentors they need for career success, have effective mentoring relationships with doctoral and postdoctoral advisers, and find other mentors when necessary. Problems in mentoring relationships include difficulty in gaining access to the eminent mentors whose sponsorship can help to jump start their careers and a series of gender-related and race-related difficulties in sustaining mentoring relationships within the academic system. (Contains 3' references.) (JDD)

16 User-Defined Format
EJ467409 JC506467
Faculty Peer Mentoring: A Strategy for Improving Instruction.
Harnish, Dorothy; Wild, Lynn A.
Community College Journal, v64 n1 p22-27 Aug-Sep 1993
Available From: UMI
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Describes a federally funded peer mentoring project for faculty development at a rural two-year college. Presents three case studies of mentoring within a division, across divisions, and interdisciplinary mentoring. Includes mentor and mentoree narratives. Offers suggestions on initiating and structuring peer mentor projects, and describes expected benefits. (PAA)

17 User-Defined Format
EJ462966 JC506370
Peer Mentoring in Higher Education: A Professional Development Strategy for Faculty.
Harnish, Dorothy; Wild, Lynn A.
Community College Journal of Research and Practice, v17 n3 p271-82 May-Jun 1993
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
Describes four community college peer mentoring programs implemented at Niagara County Community College (New York) to update faculty members' skills, promote cross-discipline cooperation, improve new/adjunct faculty teaching, and improve teaching skills through interdisciplinary mentor teams. Analyzes results of the peer mentor projects. (MAB)

18 User-Defined Format
ED365195 HE026970
Mentoring Minorities in Higher Education: Passing the Torch.
Leon, David J.
National Education Association, Washington, D.C. 1993
64p.; Part of the series, "To Promote Academic Justice and Excellence."
Available From: National Education Association, Office of Higher Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 ($10).
EDRS Price - MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
Document Type: REVIEW LITERATURE (070)
This booklet on mentoring of minority students and faculty by majority students and faculty presents information on mentoring, its background and problems associated with it. The document follows a recent joint statement on the issue by the National Education Association and the American Association of University Professors. An overview of the status of minorities in higher education covers demography, the faculty pipeline, and limitations and obstacles for minorities on campus. A section on retention programs that work describes the key features of such programs including leadership at the highest institutional levels, sound planning, an institution-wide approach, expanding the pool and pipelines, and financial support. A section specifically on mentoring in higher education defines mentoring and discusses how it has traditionally worked in American doctoral programs. It also explores obstacles to establishing mentoring programs for minorities and women faculty and offers guidelines for establishing and supporting mentoring programs. A final section explores the role of faculty and staff unions. Appendixes contain the joint National Education Association/American Association of University Professors statement on mentoring and a list of mentoring programs in higher education. (Contains 57 references.) (JB)

19 User-Defined Format
EJ461444 HE531102
Success and Survival Strategies for Women Faculty Members.
Sandler, Bernice Resnick
American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, v57 n1 p58-67 Spr 1993
Available From: UMI
Document Type: EVALUATIVE REPORT (142); POSITION PAPER (120); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)

A variety of strategies are suggested as useful to female faculty members in developing their careers and coping with nonoptimal working conditions. Issues addressed include getting information, networking and mentoring, negotiating, handling discrimination, personal presentation, sexual harassment and other sexual issues, interviews, working within the system, and relationships with students. (MSE)

20 User-Defined Format
EJ479692 HE532426
Resources for Developing Senior Faculty as Teachers.
Seal, Robert K.
New Directions for Teaching and Learning, n55 p99-111 Fall 1993
Theme issue topic: "Developing Senior Faculty as Teachers."
Available From: UMI
Document Type: BIBLIOGRAPHY (131); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
An annotated list of 38 resources is provided to help administrators, faculty developers, and faculty in designing effective renewal interventions for senior faculty. Topics include research on senior faculty, personnel policies (tenure, growth contracting), program strategies (mentoring, team teaching, motivation), and assessment of institutional work environment. (MSE)

21 User-Defined Format
EJ474627 HE532035
Mentoring Probationary Women Academics: A Pilot Programme for Career Development.
Wunsch, Marie A.
Studies in Higher Education, v18 n3 p349-62 1993
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); JOURNAL ARTICLE (080)
A program in a public research university to provide mentoring for new female faculty beginning on entry to the institution is described. The program emphasizes individual professional development and institutional factors influencing women's advancement. Activities include colleague-pairing, mentor training, a mentoring agreement, and career development workshops and seminars. (Author/MSE)

22 User-Defined Format
EJ448766 HE530200
Lessons Learned about Mentoring.
Boice, Robert
New Directions for Teaching and Learning, n50 p51-61 Sum 1992
Developing New and Junior Faculty
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); NON-CLASSROOM
MATERIAL (055)
A review of studies of mentoring for new college faculty suggests practical guidelines for maximizing the mentoring experience. Recommendations include "cataloging" (of past, current, and planned activities); group mentoring; and application of a theory stressing involvement, regimen, solving the right problem, and social networking. (DB)

23 User-Defined Format
ED343537 HE025412
The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development.
Boice, Robert
1992
376p.
ISBN: 1-55542-423-6
Available From: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Franciso, CA 94104-1310 ($31.95).
Document Not Available from EDRS.
Document Type: BOOK (010); POSITION PAPER (120)
This book offers a range of proven support strategies designed to help new faculty members thrive. Suggestions range from campuswide programs for nurturing newcomers to projects that help them to help themselves. Outlined is a structured mentoring program to build collegiality through social support networks. Also presented are specific techniques for helping new faculty find time, fluency, and balance as writers, including advice on dealing with editorial evaluations or rejections. Additionally detailed is a variety of self-help projects, including exercise and mood management groups run largely by new faculty, as well as faculty handbooks and newsletters. The book is divided into three parts. Chapters in Part One deal with the three obstacles facing most new faculty: collegiality, teaching, and writing. The chapters contained in Part Two, which moves from observation to intervention, portray new faculty overcoming obstacles, as colleagues, teachers, and scholarly writers in structured programs. Finally, chapters in Part Three discuss ways of building an institutional support system. The resource section at the end of the book presents the questionnaire used for the interviews of new faculty discussed throughout. Contains 322 references and an index. (GLR)

24 User-Defined Format
EJ448767 HE530201
Improving Junior Faculty Scholarship.
Jarvis, Donald K.
New Directions for Teaching and Learning, n50 p63-72 Sum 1992
Developing New and Junior Faculty
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); REVIEW LITERATURE (070); NON-CLASSROOM
MATERIAL (055)
Based on a review of studies on junior faculty development programs, this paper focuses specifically on development of research skills. It stresses the importance of administrative support, good management, orientation toward the future, collegiality, mentoring, group projects, research centers, travel money, time for research, financial support, facilities and equipment, and good maintenance. (DB)

25 User-Defined Format
ED350920 HE025898
Maxims for Mentoring.
Kirk, James J.
[1992
13p.
EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
Document Type: NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
This paper describes five maxims for an effective faculty mentoring program developed at Western Carolina University (North Carolina) designed to increase retention of new faculty. The first maxim, "ask what the program will do for the school," emphasizes that a program should not be undertaken until this question has been specifically and thoroughly answered. This section notes that at Western Carolina University (WCU) the mentoring program was set up to help new faculty and their families, typically from urban areas, adjust to a rural southern lifestyle. A description of the second maxim, "formality follows functionality," details how the WCU planners designed the function of their program and then let the content of the elements influence their decision about administrative policies and procedures. The third maxim, "choices increase chances for compatibility," discusses the central importance of the matching procedures that bring suitable mentors and mentees together. The fourth maxim, "helpers need helping too," shows the importance of support for mentors in manuals and support groups. The final maxim, "hindsight improves foresight," discusses the value of evaluation after the program's first year of operation. Three figures are included. (JB)

26 User-Defined Format
EJ443115 HE529725
Summary and Bibliographic Report.
Lively, Buford T.; And Others
American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, v56 n1 p82-84 Spr 1992
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); BIBLIOGRAPHY (131)
The application of general principles of mentoring to pharmacy education is briefly discussed, and annotated and nonannotated bibliographies of readings on mentoring are offered. Faculty-to-faculty mentoring is emphasized in the citations, but some readings also apply to faculty-student and practitioner-student relationships. (MSE)

27 User-Defined Format
EJ475297 UD517693
"Doing" Gender: (En)Gendering Academic Mentoring.
Olson, Gary A.; Ashton-Jones, Evelyn
Journal of Education, v174 n3 p114-27 1992
Available From: UMI
Document Type: PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141); EVALUATIVE REPORT (142); JOURNAL
ARTICLE (080)
Cross-gender mentoring in the academic professions is explored, taking into account interactional gender politics and power relations as they are encoded in relationships in society at large. The presentation takes the form of a conversation between the authors to attempt to contextualize the theoretical and abstract within the personal and experiential. (SLD)

28 User-Defined Format
ED350906 HE025882
Success and Survival Strategies for Women Faculty Members.
Sandler, Bernice Resnick
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C. May 1992
13p.
Sponsoring Agency: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, New York, NY. College Retirement Equities Fund.
Available From: Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 ($5 plus $2 postage).
EDRS Price - MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
Document Type: REVIEW LITERATURE (070); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)

This paper offers a strategy for how women faculty members can change their behaviors in order to enhance their own careers in higher education. The paper opens by describing three types of issues that may hinder the advancement of women while noting that this guide addresses primarily the psychological aspects. Following this introduction seven general recommendations are listed which are: (1) being active on one's own behalf; (2) developing a strategy to guide progress over 5 years; (3) seeking information and advice; (4) keeping careful records; (5) working on more than one project at a time; (6) actively seeking professional feedback; and (7) developing a mentor and network of contacts. Following sections discuss the specific strategies in detail from being knowledgeable about institutional policies and regulations to networking and mentoring. A discussion of negotiating notes how often it is a part of professional dealings and suggests strategies for handling different situations. Handling discrimination is addressed including how to pick battles, controlling emotional responses to discrimination, and the use of humor. Personal presentation and questions of self-confidence are also discussed including: how to promote oneself, how to handle sexual harassment, other sexual issues, interviews, working the system, and relationships with students. Nineteen notes and 20 references are included. (JB)

29 User-Defined Format
EJ450970 UD516772
Faculty-Faculty Mentoring and Discrimination: Perceptions among Asian, Asian American, and Pacific Island Faculty.
Sands, Roberta G.; And Others
Equity and Excellence, v25 n2-4 p124-29 Win 1992
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); RESEARCH REPORT (143)
Explores mentoring and other career support given and received by Asian college faculty through a mail questionnaire answered by 307 white faculty members selected at random and 71 Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander faculty members. Asian minority faculty had not had as much mentoring as had white counterparts. (SLD)

30 User-Defined Format
EJ448169 CG541287
Designing Effective Mentoring Programs: Historical Perspectives and Current Issues.
Scott, Mary E.
Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, v30 n4 p167-77 Jun 1992
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); HISTORICAL MATERIAL (060); REVIEW LITERATURE (070)
Explores the historical development of mentoring and several current critical issues in mentoring: purpose and process, characteristics of mentors, the establishment and duration of mentoring relationships, and mentoring for women and minorities. Notes that personnel in academic settings need to consider these issues when implementing a mentoring program. (Author/NB)

31 User-Defined Format
EJ454990 SE550309
Mentoring, Role Modeling, and the Career Development of Junior Science Faculty.
Waxman, Merle
Journal of College Science Teaching, v22 n2 p124-27 1992
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); TEACHING GUIDE (052)
This article describes problems of junior science faculty members and suggests recommendations explaining how mentoring and role modeling can be supplied to assist faculty members with ascending the "faculty ladder." (PR)

32 User-Defined Format
EJ448769 HE530203
The Role of the Chairperson in Support of Junior Faculty.
Wheeler, Daniel W.
New Directions for Teaching and Learning, n50 p87-96 Sum 1992
Developing New and Junior Faculty
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); NON-CLASSROOM MATERIAL (055)
This article identifies junior faculty needs and links these to roles that department chairpersons can assume, including that of a resource link; a mentor; a facilitator of mentor relationships; an institutional authority or representative; an evaluator; a faculty developer; and a model of balance. Specific suggestions for assisting with tangible and collegial resources are listed. (DB)

33 User-Defined Format
ED339312 HE025097
Barriers to Success in Academic Life: Perceptions of Faculty Women in a Colleague Pairing Program. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
Johnsrud, Linda K.; Wunsch, Marie
Oct 1991
32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).

EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
Document Type: RESEARCH REPORT (143); CONFERENCE PAPER (150)
A study was done to explore the perceptions of senior and junior faculty women regarding the barriers to success experienced early in their academic careers. The study population was drawn from a colleague pairing program at a major urban research university in the western United States and consisted of 22 junior faculty in tenure track positions matched with tenured senior faculty. A factor analysis of data from responses to surveys administered before the pairs met and after two semesters when the pairing program ended revealed three areas of concern: roles and responsibilities, a sense of belonging, and personal security. Further examination found significant differences between the senior and junior women's perceptions before and after the program on all three factors, namely that the perception of the importance of the factors decreased during the program for both junior and senior women. Also, junior women perceived most barriers as less problematic than their senior counterparts anticipated. The findings suggest important directions for programmatic efforts to retain and advance women as well as areas of needed research. Included are 4 tables and 27 references. (JB)

34 User-Defined Format
EJ431975 SP520644
Reflections on Professorial Mentorships.
Krockover, Gerald R.
Teaching Education, v3 n2 p113-14 Win-Spr 1991
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
A science education professor reflects on the help of his mentor throughout his career. The mentor provided support and confidence during his first semester, helped him establish a publishing and grant program, and offered guidance. The article recommends mentorship programs for new professors. (SM)

35 User-Defined Format
EJ436145 HE529241
Mentoring and Pretenure Faculty Development.
Lowe, Alan A.; And Others
Journal of Dental Education, v55 n10 p675-78 Oct 1991
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); PROJECT DESCRIPTION (141)
The University of British Columbia (Canada) Dental School uses teaching and research mentors for new faculty, together with a structured semiannual review process, to clearly identify faculty expectations for tenure. Pretenure faculty have appreciated the clear and regular input concerning their progress, and mentors enjoy the interaction with younger faculty. (MSE)

36 User-Defined Format
EJ425854 FL520898
Minding Our Business.
Rava, Susan
ADFL Bulletin, v22 n3 p51-53 Spr 1991
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); POSITION PAPER (120)
A model is presented that offers a basic framework for mentoring. The model insists on a renewed commitment of faculty members to a new generation of teachers, and envisages the professor's role not only as the model of a scholar but also as a partner in teaching. (three references) (JL)

37 User-Defined Format
EJ424759 HE528135
Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University.
Sands, Roberta G.; And Others
Journal of Higher Education, v62 n2 p174-93 Mar-Apr 1991
Available From: UMI
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); RESEARCH REPORT (143)
A study of the nature and extent of mentoring and other forms of career support among faculty (n=347) found that mentoring was not prevalent. Where occurring, it was mutually negotiated, primarily between persons of the same sex and between assistant and full professors. Four mentor types emerged. (Author/MSE)

38 User-Defined Format
EJ422833 EA525314
Mentoring: Bridge over Troubled Waters.
Shelton, Maria
Journal of School Leadership, v1 n1 p38-45 Jan 1991
Available from Technomic Publishing Company, Inc., 851 New Holland Avenue, Box 3535, Lancaster, PA 17604.
Document Type: JOURNAL ARTICLE (080); EVALUATIVE REPORT (142)
Higher education terminology, culture, and performance standards differ drastically from those of public schools. As new professors enter this divergent world, they need assistance from professors whose experience and knowledge should be shared. This article calls for a mentoring system that provides success for all professors. Includes 28 references. (MLH)

Legal Analysis

The NEA Peer Assistance and Review Resolution: A Legal Analysis

August 20, 1997

Prepared by the NEA
Office of General Counsel

I. Introduction 2

II. Discussion 2

III. Conclusion 17

I. Introduction

The 1997 NEA Representative Assembly adopted Resolution New D (Peer Assistance and Review programs), a copy of which is attached to this memorandum. During the Representative Assembly debate, several questions were asked regarding potential legal problems that might be involved in the type of program envisioned by Resolution New D. Specifically, these questions related to the peer review aspect of the program, which calls upon rank-and-file teachers (i.e., those persons who are not employed as principals, assistant principals, or in other traditional supervisory positions) to participate in the evaluation of the job performance of other rank-and-file teachers. (In order to reflect this focus, we will in this memorandum use the term "peer review program.") The NEA General Counsel responded to these questions, and several requests have been made for a written copy of the information that he provided. That information is set forth (in more orderly and expanded fashion) in this memorandum.

II. Discussion

From a local association's point of view, there are two principal areas of potential legal concern in a peer review program. One concern is that the performance of evaluative functions could make a consulting teacher or a teacher member of the joint governing body a "supervisory" employee within the meaning of the controlling labor relations statute, and that this in turn could result in his or her exclusion from the teacher bargaining unit, and perhaps even from the coverage of the statute itself. (The legal analysis is the same with regard to a consulting teacher and a teacher member of the joint governing body; for

purposes of simplicity in discussion, we use the term "consulting teacher" in this memorandum to refer to both.) The other concern is with the duty of fair representation ("DFR") that a local association which is recognized as an exclusive collective bargaining representative owes to the bargaining unit teachers who are involved in the peer review program, including both participating teachers who are subjected to an adverse employment action, and consulting teachers who are named by participating teachers in challenges to adverse employment actions.

Before turning to the foregoing concerns, two preliminary comments are appropriate:

A. Because both bargaining unit status and the DFR are elements of a collective bargaining arrangement, they are by definition of direct relevance only to local associations in jurisdictions that have a statute authorizing collective bargaining in public education. It should not be assumed, however, that a peer review program poses no potential legal concerns in non-collective bargaining jurisdictions. Any local association that is involved in such a program, and individual association members who function as consulting teachers, potentially may be subject to civil liability claims under the common law and a host of federal and state statutes by a participating teacher against whom an adverse employment action is taken. These include claims of unlawful racial or gender discrimination, defamation for critical comments made about a teacher, interference with contractual relations, and violation of constitutional rights for actions allegedly taken without affording a teacher the requisite due process or in retaliation for a teacher's exercise of protected First Amendment

rights.[1] A detailed discussion of the various legal theories underlying such claims is beyond the scope of this memorandum. Suffice it to say that, although participation in any decisionmaking process that adversely affects a teacher's employment puts a local association and individual association members at risk of being sued, there is little likelihood that liability will be found if they act in good faith and render decisions based on their best professional judgment.

B. We discuss in this memorandum the problems that peer review programs pose for local associations and individual teachers in the bargaining unit -- more specifically, the questions of bargaining unit status and DFR -- but these programs also put school districts at risk. In any lawsuit involving alleged unlawful employment discrimination, defamation, violation of constitutional rights, etc., the school district presumably would be named as a primary defendant.[2] Moreover, to the extent that a board of education merely "rubber-stamps" non-renewal or termination recommendations made by a "board composed of an equal number or a majority of representatives appointed by the local association," Resolution New D, principle (b), the board of education may be subject to a charge of improper delegation of its statutory responsibility. See Resolution New D, principle (c) ("recommendations forwarded by the joint governing body are routinely accepted and acted upon by the district.")

---

[1] Illustrative is the case of Featherstone v. Columbus Public Schools, et al., which now is pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, and which includes the Columbus Education Association and its president among the defendants. The plaintiff in this case is a teacher in the Columbus Public Schools who was subjected to an adverse employment action after his participation in the School District/Columbus Education Association Peer Assistance and review Program. In addition to alleging a DFR violation (Ohio is a collective bargaining state), the lawsuit advances many of the claims referenced in text.

[2] See, Featherstone v. Columbus Public Schools, et al., discussed in footnote 1, supra.

We turn now to the two primary legal concerns about peer review programs that were expressed during the Representative Assembly debate -- dealing in turn with bargaining unit status (Section A) and the DFR (Section B).

A. Bargaining Unit Status

The question of bargaining unit status is addressed in Resolution New D, principle (m), which provides as follows:

> Guarantee that participating teachers, consulting teachers, and teachers who sit on governing bodies do not lose their Association membership or bargaining unit status by virtue of their participation in the program.

As written, this is not a statement of law, but rather a policy position, i.e., NEA advises local associations not to become involved in a peer review program unless, among other things, "bargaining unit status" is preserved. The dispositive question is whether this result can be achieved under the type of peer review program envisioned by Resolution New D. Before explaining why the answer to this question is "yes," it is appropriate to deal with several ancillary points that are raised by principle (m).

The reference in principle (m) to "participating teachers" is extraneous. The concerns that inform that principle derive from the evaluative functions that are performed by consulting teachers, and there is nothing in a peer review program that would call into question the bargaining unit status of participating teachers.

The other point involves the reference in principle (m) to continued eligibility for "Association membership," a concern which again presumably derives from the evaluative

functions performed by consulting teachers. We are aware of no general legal proposition that would prohibit a consulting teacher -- whether he or she is included in or excluded from the teacher bargaining unit -- from retaining his or her association membership.

It has been suggested, however, that a consulting teacher might be ineligible for membership in an association that is not "all-inclusive" -- i.e., that does not include supervisors. But any concern on this score is unfounded. Within certain broad limits of rationality and non-discrimination, associations are free to interpret their own governing document as they see fit, and it would be rather perverse to adopt a construction that precludes teachers from association membership because they participate in a program that is developed and implemented by the association.

This brings us to the heart of the matter -- i.e., the bargaining unit status of consulting teachers. The appropriate starting point is to consider whether and under what circumstances a consulting teacher in a peer review program of the type envisioned by Resolution new D would be classified as a "supervisor" for legal purposes.

The National Labor Relations Act ("NLRA"), which governs labor relations in the private sector, defines a "supervisor" as follows:

> The term "supervisor" means any individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

29 U.S.C. § 152(11). In applying this definition, the National Labor Relations Board ("NLRB") has focused on an employee's actual authority, rather than on his or her title or job description. The definition does not require an employee to have final authority, but only the authority "effectively to recommend," which is satisfied if the ultimate decisionmaker generally follows or relies heavily upon the recommendations. Moreover, consistent with the use of the word "or," the definition has been interpreted disjunctively, so that an employee need only have authority in one of the enumerated areas in order to be classified as a supervisor. Finally, a person who exercises the requisite authority to any significant extent generally is deemed to be a supervisor, even if he or she spends the bulk of his or her time doing rank-and-file work. In effect, the definition is intended to target those employees who serve as representatives of the employer's interests with respect to the workforce, and who are, in that sense, aligned with management.

Although there are some exceptions, most public sector collective bargaining statutes establish a supervisor classification, and use a definition that is the same as, or similar to, that in the NLRA.[3] State courts and administrative agencies likewise have looked to private sector precedents in applying the definition. Whether a consulting teacher in any particular peer review program would constitute a statutory supervisor would depend on the precise

---

[3] Illustrative of the exceptions to the general rule is Alaska. The Alaska Public Employment Relations at, Alaska Stat. 23.40.070 et seq., which covers, among other things, faculty at public colleges and universities, does not make any special provision for supervisors. Moreover, even in those states that have enacted statutes with a supervisor classification, it is necessary to examine the definition carefully, inasmuch as seemingly minor differences in language may have significant effect. By way of illustration, the definition of a "supervisor' in the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act appears at first glance to be similar to that in the NLRA, but it has two differences that significantly limit the reach of the exclusion. The Illinois statute does not include the power "to direct" work as a ba... for finding supervisory status, and expressly provides that "[t]he term 'supervisor' includes only those individuals who devote a preponderance of their employment time to exercising [supervisory] authority." Ill. Rev. Stat. Ch. 48 §1701 (1984).

definition in the relevant statute, and the specific nature of the program in question. For present purposes, however, we will assume that consulting teachers in fact would be classified as supervisors, and consider what that classification means vis-à-vis their bargaining unit status.

Under the NLRA, a supervisor has no protected right to join or assist a labor organization or to bargain collectively. A private sector employer can, if it chooses, discharge a supervisor for union activity. By the same token, the NLRA does not prohibit an employer from voluntarily recognizing a union as the collective bargaining representative for a unit that includes both rank-and-file and supervisory employees, or a separate unit that is comprised entirely of supervisory employees.[4]

Approximately 15 states follow the NLRA approach in this regard, and their public sector collective bargaining statutes exclude supervisors from the coverage of the statute. The remaining states -- some 25 in number -- include supervisors within the protection of the statute, but the statutes differ in terms of their bargaining unit status. A few provide that supervisors must be in separate bargaining units, while others leave the question of a

---

[4] The relevant statutory provision is 29 U.S.C. §164(a), which provides that:

> Nothing herein shall prohibit any individual employed as a supervisor from becoming or remaining a member of a labor organization, but no employer subject to this Act shall be compelled to deem individuals defined herein as supervisors as employees for the purpose of any law, either national or local, relating to collective bargaining.

In certain crafts (e.g., the printing and building trades), where supervisors historically have been members of unions of non-supervisory employees, employers often have voluntarily recognized the union as the representative of a mixed bargaining unit rather than upset an existing arrangement.

supervisor's unit placement to administrative determination. Finally, some public sector collective bargaining statutes -- although relatively few -- permit truly mixed units of supervisory and non-supervisory employees.

It is important to emphasize that the above discussion indicates the bargaining unit arrangements that an employer or a union may insist upon under a particular public sector collective bargaining statute. What this means in practical terms is that an administrative agency will not, over the objection of a party, certify a union as the representative for a unit that is inconsistent with the statutory pattern. As in the private sector, however, there is, to our knowledge, nothing in any public sector collective bargaining statute that would prevent a school district from voluntarily recognizing a local association as the exclusive representative for a unit that includes both rank-and-file teachers and teachers who might under the statutory definition be deemed to constitute supervisors.

To the extent that a local association wishes to be sure that teachers in a peer review program are not excluded from the teacher bargaining unit, it could propose that a provision such as the following be included in the collective bargaining agreement (or in the agreement establishing the peer review program if a separate document):

> The School District agrees that it will not seek to exclude any employee from the bargaining unit based upon his or her participation in the [insert official name of peer review program], nor will it rely on such participation to in any way alter the structure of the bargaining unit.

We believe that this provision would be fully enforceable. And if a school district refused to agree to such a provision, it is unlikely that the "circumstances," see Resolution New D, are such as to warrant development and implementation of a peer review program.

In the Representative Assembly debate over Resolution New D, reference was made to the 1980 decision of the United States Supreme Court in National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva, 444 U.S. 672 (1980) ("Yeshiva"). In this case, faculty at Yeshiva University, which is a private institution, were excluded from the coverage of the NLRA as "managerial" employees because of their participation in faculty committees which made recommendations as to curriculum, grading, policy, student admissions and matriculation standards, etc. Although Yeshiva involved a construction of the NLRA (and is thus by its terms confined to the private sector), and dealt with managerial as opposed to supervisory employees, it was suggested that the Court's reasoning might provide a basis for excluding consulting teachers from a teacher bargaining unit. We disagree: for the reasons explained below, Yeshiva is of no present relevance.

In addition to supervisors and certain other categories who are expressly excluded from the NLRA's definition of "employee," the NLRB, as a matter of policy, excludes as "managerial" employees those who "formulate and effectuate management policies by expressing and making operative the decisions of their employer." Palace Laundry Dry Cleaning Corp., 75 N.L.R.B. 320, 323 n.4 (1947). The importance of the managerial exclusion dramatically increased in 1980 as a result of Yeshiva. When the Yeshiva University Faculty Association ("YUFA") sought to represent in collective bargaining a unit consisting of full-time faculty, the University contended that the faculty were managerial.

The NLRB disagreed and, following an election in which YUFA was successful, ordered the University to bargain. The University refused, and the United States Second Circuit Court of Appeals denied enforcement of the NLRB's order. The Supreme Court affirmed, agreeing with the Second Circuit that the Yeshiva faculty "'in effect, substantially and pervasively operate[e] the enterprise'." NLRB v. Yeshiva University, 444 U.S. 672, 691 (1980).[5]

It is against this legal backdrop that we now consider whether and to what extent Yeshiva has relevance to the bargaining unit status of consulting teachers in a peer review program. The first point to note is that Yeshiva is a private sector case based on the legislative history of the NLRA, and neither the Court's holding nor reasoning are, in any sense, controlling precedent in the public sector. Indeed, efforts to achieve a Yeshiva result even in public sector higher education, much less at the elementary/secondary level, have uniformly been unsuccessful. Yeshiva is, moreover, concerned with managerial as opposed to supervisory employees, and the Court's reasoning even on its own terms has limited applicability in the later context. Finally, the issue arose in Yeshiva only because the University was hostile to collective bargaining, and relied on the managerial exclusion in order to avoid recognizing YUFA as a collective bargaining representative. As Resolution New D indicates, a local association would be ill-advised in such circumstances to attempt to develop and implement a peer review program.[6]

---

[5] This finding was based on the record in the case, and the Court emphasized that it was "certainly ... not suggesting an application of the managerial exclusion that would sweep all professionals outside the Act in derogation of Congress' expressed intent to protect them." Id. at 690.

[6] One related problem bears mention in regard to the functions that are performed by consulting teachers. There are statutes in some jurisdictions that assign specific evaluative responsibilities to individuals with administrative/ supervisory certification. Illustrative is New Jersey, in which state law requires nontenured teachers to be evaluated by a "certified

B. DFR

In connection with a peer review program, the DFR must be considered in two contexts: (1) the obligation of a local association to provide representation for a participating teacher who seeks to challenge an adverse employment action, and (2) the obligation of a local association to provide representation for a consulting teacher if a participating teacher claims that the former was responsible for an adverse employment action, or that some other action taken by the consulting teacher damaged him or her. Although this is the most problematical of the potential legal issues involved in a peer review program, it is not triggered by Resolution New D. This is because the Resolution by its terms takes no position on whether and under what circumstances a local association should provide such representational services. To the contrary, principle (l) cautions the local association to "[e]nsure due process protection and duty of fair representation procedures," which we construe to mean "consult your local attorney" to avoid a problem in this regard. In order to address the concerns that have been expressed regarding the DFR, however, we move

---

supervisor." If improvement is needed, then an "individual professional improvement plan" must be developed by the "supervisor" and the teacher. N.J.A.C. 6:3-4.3(a),(f)3, and (h)1. Similarly, in Pennsylvania, before a teacher can be dismissed for "incompetency or unsatisfactory teaching performance," he or she first must be "rated" by the school superintendent, assistant superintendent, supervisor, or principal. 24 P.S. § 11-1123.

The interplay between statutes of this type and peer review programs is by no means clear. For example, would a statutorily-mandated evaluation procedure be deemed to "occupy the field," and prevent a side-by-side peer review program? If not, to what extent would the statute limit the pool of employees who could serve as consulting teachers? Answers to these and similar questions cannot be given in the abstract, but would depend on the specific nature of the peer review program in question, the precise language of the statute, and how the statute has been interpreted -- which provides support for the general proposition that a local association should consult with its own attorney before moving forward.

beyond the terms of Resolution New D itself, and discuss briefly the nature and application of the DFR.

Starting once again with the NLRA, a private sector union is as a general matter free to determine the policies it will follow in representing bargaining unit employees; but the DFR obligates it to at least represent each such employee fairly and without hostile discrimination. As the Supreme Court explained:

> [T]he exclusive agent's statutory authority to represent all members of a designated unit includes a[n] ... obligation to serve the interests of all members without hostility or discrimination toward any, to exercise its discretion with complete good faith and honesty, and to avoid arbitrary conduct.

Vaca v. Sipes, 386 U.S. 171, 177 (1967).

Because the DFR is cast in rather broad terms -- e.g., "good faith," "arbitrary conduct," etc. -- cases often turn on subjective assessments of union motives and attitudes. Certain rules are clear, however. A union itself may judge the validity of grievances, and need not process a grievance when it believes that the action of an employer was justified. Indeed, a union properly may refrain from pursuing even meritorious grievances, so long as the factors that it relies on in making this determination are reasonable (e.g., available resources, competing interests of other bargaining unit employees). On the other hand, union actions based on discriminatory motives, on whether or not the employee involved is a member of the union, on whether he or she is popular or unpopular with a particular faction within the union, etc., would not pass muster.

As indicated, the DFR was developed in the private sector as a necessary corollary to the concept of exclusive recognition. Exclusive recognition is also the cornerstone of public sector labor relations, and to our knowledge every jurisdiction -- by statute or case law -- imposes a DFR on the exclusive representative. In applying the DFR, the public sector has relied essentially on NLRA precedent, and we are aware of no significant differences between the public and private sectors in this regard.

The first question posed in the present context is whether and under what circumstances a local association could refuse to represent a participating teacher who is subject to an adverse employment action as the result of a recommendation processed through a peer review program such as that envisioned in Resolution New D. Although not entirely free from doubt, we believe that, consistent with its DFR, a local association could deny representation in all such cases on a uniform, non-discriminatory, basis. It is important to emphasize, however, that the foregoing conclusion assumes that the peer review program has operated in the individual case in accordance with Resolution New D, that the participating teacher has been accorded all of the requisite safeguards, and that the consulting teacher has acted responsibly and in good faith. Indeed, this assumption would be relevant not only with regard to the local association's DFR, but it would in addition be relevant to the caution in principle (l) of Resolution New D that the peer review program "[e]nsure due process protection."

A local association, on the other hand, could opt to provide representation for participating teachers in some or all cases. But this position implicates certain other considerations. To begin with, a local association that makes representational decisions on a

case-by-case basis -- rather than pursuant to an across-the-board policy of denying (or providing) representation in all cases --- may be more susceptible to DFR claims. In response to such claims, a local association would have to demonstrate the rationality and good faith of each decision not to provide representation on the basis of a particular factual record.

Moreover, to the extent that a local association has confidence in the integrity of the peer review program, it should feel both legally and organizationally secure in refusing to represent participating teachers who seek to challenge adverse employment actions that emerge from the program. Providing such representation tends to suggest at least some uncertainty on the part of a local association in this regard.

Finally, if a consulting teacher is included in the challenge, a local association would be representing a participating teacher against someone who in effect was functioning as an agent of the local association. And if the local association decides to provide representation for consulting teachers (see discussion infra), it could find itself on both sides of the issue.

A similar legal analysis applies with regard to a local association's DFR obligation to represent a consulting teacher against a claim by a participating teacher that he or she contributed to an adverse employment action. Once again, it is our view that, without violating its DFR, a local association categorically could refuse to represent members of the bargaining unit for actions taken while acting in supervisory positions --i.e., as consulting teachers. (In conjunction with this position, a local association should attempt, through collective bargaining or otherwise, to have the school district provide bargaining unit

members with appropriate protection for actions taken by them while performing functions as employer representatives.)

Although a local association probably could take the above position without encountering any DFR difficulties, the position could be politically problematic. If a consulting teacher acted in good faith and rendered decisions on the basis of his or her best professional judgment, a local association would seem hard-pressed to deny representation to the consulting teacher if he or she is sued for actions taken while he or she was participating in a local association program.

A related question that arose during the Representative Assembly debate on Resolution New D is whether NEA's Educators Employment Liability ("EEL") Program would provide coverage for a consulting teacher who is the subject of a claim by a participating teacher. Because, prior to the adoption of Resolution New D, NEA categorically was opposed to peer review programs at the elementary/secondary school level, NEA could not as a matter of policy include such coverage in the NEA-funded national EEL Program.[7]

In order to accommodate certain NEA affiliates that were involved in peer review programs at the elementary/secondary school level, NEA arranged with the EEL Program insurance carrier to offer a K-12 Peer Review Coverage Option ("Option") to interested state associations, at state association expense. The Option became available beginning with the

---

[7] Since 1984, the EEL Program, at NEA expense, has provided coverage for members who perform evaluative functions in a college or university peer review program. This coverage has been consistent with NEA's traditional support for peer review programs in higher education.

1996-97 membership year, and was purchased by five state associations. As of June 17, 1997, nine state associations had purchased the Option for the 1997-98 membership year (Arkansas, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, South Carolina, and Wyoming). It is, of course, possible that the adoption of Resolution New D will prompt other state associations to purchase the Option, but this has not happened as of the date of this memorandum. The per member premium for the Option varies from state-to-state, depending on the loss experience in that state with regard to basic EEL Program coverage, and the statutory obligation of school districts to provide liability coverage for teachers. For the 1997-98 membership year, the rate ranges from a baseline premium of 15¢ per eligible member (i.e., 15¢ x total Active, ESP, Active Life, Retired Life, Student, and Substitute members, and agency fee payers) to a maximum premium of 20¢ per eligible member.

III. Conclusion

Peer review programs of the type envisioned by Resolution New D are on-going in various school districts throughout the country, with the most prominent programs in Columbus, Ohio (involving the NEA-affiliated Columbus Education Association), Rochester, New York (involving the AFT-affiliated Rochester Teachers Association), and Toledo, Ohio (involving the AFT-affiliated Toledo Federation of Teachers). We are not aware of any court decision specifically sustaining the Columbus, Rochester, or Toledo program on its merits. But the fact that these programs have been in operation for extended periods apparently without encountering any significant legal difficulty[8] does at least tend to

[8] This is not to suggest that these programs have been litigation-free. In addition to the pending lawsuit against the peer review program in the Columbus Public Schools, see footnote 1, supra, numerous lawsuits and administrative complaints have been filed against

buttress -- albeit by no means conclusively -- our belief that a local association can become involved in a peer review program of the type envisioned by Resolution New D without undue concern about its DFR or other liability.

We conclude our legal analysis with the following caution. Although there are occasional references in this memorandum to the law in a particular jurisdiction, these references primarily are for illustrative purposes; for the most part, we have cast the discussion in general terms. The various legal propositions that we have set forth probably have across-the-board application, but there may be some jurisdiction-to-jurisdiction variations that could impact on the development and implementation of a peer review program. Accordingly, a local association should be fully apprised of the specific nature of all relevant legal requirements before proceeding down this path.

---

the Toledo Federation of Teachers based upon its participation in that school district's peer review program, but none has been successful. See D. Lawrence, The Relevance of Yeshiva to Public Education: A Union Perspective, 16 J.Law & Educ. 113, 116 (1987). In the most recent lawsuit involving the Toledo peer review program that named the Toledo Federation of Teachers as a defendant -- Gallant v. Toledo Public Schools, et al., 68 ED ¶ 44,056 (Ohio Ct. of Appeals 1992) -- summary judgment was granted for the defendants.

D-6. Peer Assistance and Review Programs

The National Education Association believes that high standards within the teaching profession and continuous improvement in professional practices are cornerstones of the profession. Some local associations may conclude that, under certain circumstances, a peer assistance or a peer assistance and review program is an appropriate mechanism for achieving these objectives.

The primary purpose of any such program should be to provide "assistance"—to improve professional practice, retain promising teachers, and build professional knowledge to improve student success. A local association may, at its option, also decide to include a "review" component in the program—involving the evaluation of performance. If a local association takes either position, the program should—

a. Be developed through collective bargaining or through a joint association/school district agreement in nonbargaining states

b. Be governed by a board composed of an equal number or a majority of representatives appointed by the local association

c. Acknowledge that the school district makes the final decision to retain or seek nonrenewal or termination, but that recommendations forwarded by the joint governing body are routinely accepted and acted upon by the district

d. Ensure that only teachers who are deemed by their peers to be highly skilled practitioners are selected for the role of consulting teacher, that the consulting teacher's area of expertise is the same as or closely related to that of the participating teacher, and that the consulting teacher is chosen by the program governing bodies with the approval of the participating teacher involved

e. Seek consulting teachers who reflect the diverse population of the teaching staff

f. Provide that consulting teachers are properly compensated and provided adequate time to fulfill their responsibilities

g. Provide that consulting teachers receive extensive and ongoing training in mentoring/coaching skills, district initiatives and resources, and current education instructional methods

h. Establish guidelines for the referral of teachers as well as safeguards to prevent unwarranted referrals

i. Establish and convey to all consulting and participating teachers clear rules on allowable uses of documents, products, and communications arising from the program

j. Require extensive documentation based on ongoing assessments of each participant

k. Require that rigorous and extensive assistance be provided over an appropriate period of time to help the participating teacher attain the requisite standard of proficiency before any effort to

counsel the participating teacher out of the profession is made or a recommendation to initiate nonrenewal or termination proceedings is issued

l. Ensure due process protection and duty of fair representation procedures

m. Guarantee that participating teachers, consulting teachers, and teachers who sit on governing bodies do not lose their Association membership or bargaining unit status by virtue of their participation in the program. (97)

PEER REVIEW:

A Guide for Faculty Bargainers

Prepared by the Community College Association/CTA/NEA

April, 1989

Introduction

Among the most important changes brought about by AB 1725 is the requirement that each community college district have, by July 1, 1990, a system of evaluation that includes peer review. The following is meant as a general guideline for chapters in dealing with this requirement. Because of the diversity of individual college districts, no attempt has been made to develop a single "boiler-plate" approach to this subject. Rather, the guide is based upon the following assumptions:

- First, peer review is a requirement of law which must be met.
- Second, in order to adequately protect faculty rights, peer review should be bargained and must be subject to certain basic tenets of due process.
- Third, the concept of peer review is a broad one that allows for a great deal of individual variation. Faculties should fully consider what kind of peer review is best for them.

What is peer review?

Peer review is a technique for evaluating the quality of performance of faculty which utilizes faculty to evaluate other faculty. Peer review, as a technique, has its roots in the medieval university. It is also an integral part of American higher education, since peer review is utilized in most four-year institutions.

What are the pros and cons of peer review?

As a concept, peer review has both passionate adherents and vehement detractors. Briefly stated, their relative positions are as follows:

Pros:

- Peer review provides faculty true self-determination by allowing them a direct role in controlling the quality of instruction.
- Peer review can insure that evaluators possess subject matter competence.
- Peer review removes the evaluation process from administrative games playing.

Cons:

- Peer review is a divisive process that pits one colleague against another.
- Peer review tends to reinforce white-male dominance of academia.
- Peer review discourages originality and innovation in instruction.

Regardless of how one might feel about peer review, however, the fact remains that peer review is now mandated by law.

Relevant legal provisions

Section 87663 of the Education Code:

(a) Contract employees shall be evaluated at least once in each academic year. Regular employees shall be evaluated at least once in every three academic years. Temporary employees shall be evaluated within the first year of employment. Thereafter, evaluation shall be at least once every six regular semesters, or once every nine regular quarters, as applicable.

(b) Whenever an evaluation is required of a certificated employee by a community college district, the evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the standards and procedures established by the rules and regulations of the governing board of the employing district.

(c) Evaluations shall include, but not be limited to, a peer review process.

(d) The peer review process shall be on a departmental or divisional basis, and shall address the forthcoming demographics of California, and the principles of affirmative action. The process shall require that the peers reviewing are both representative of the diversity of California and sensitive to affirmative action concerns, all without compromising quality and excellence in teaching.

(e) The Legislature recognizes that faculty evaluation procedures may be negotiated as part of the collective bargaining process.

(f) In those districts where faculty evaluation procedures are collectively bargained, the faculty's exclusive representative shall consult with the academic senate prior to engaging in collective bargaining regarding those procedures.

(g) It is the intent of the Legislature that faculty evaluation include, to the extent practicable, student evaluation.

(h) A probationary faculty member shall be accorded the right to be evaluated under clear, fair, and equitable evaluation procedures

locally defined through the collective bargaining process where the faculty has chosen to elect an exlusive representative. Those procedures shall ensure good-faith treatment of the probationary faculty member without according him or her de facto tenure rights.

(i) Governing boards shall establish and disseminate written evaluation procedures for administrators. It is the intent of the Legislature that evaluation of administrators include, to the extent possible, faculty evaluation.

Basic concepts of Evaluation

Evaluation of faculty has three basic purposes:

- quality control
- compliance with the law
- protection of the rights and interests of faculty

Evaluation may be broadly divided into two types: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is aimed at helping faculty improve performance. Summative evaluation is designed to provide the basis for decisions concerning retention, promotion, discipline, and dismissal.

Quality Control

Both formative and summative evaluation may deal with the issue of quality control. Formative evaluation provides faculty with input that can be extremely useful in improving performance. It can provide positive reinforcement and guidance by informed colleagues. Opportunities for formative evaluation are sadly lacking on most campuses.

Summative evaluation deals with quality control more directly in theory. It provides rewards or punishments based on the quality of performance. Poor performance can lead to the denial of tenure, to disciplinary action, or to dismissal. Summative evaluation is a major preoccupation of college managers. Summative evaluation is, however, much like the rain: everybody talks about it but very few do anything about it.

Peer review may be utilized for either formative or summative quality control.

Compliance with law

Community college districts are require by law to evaluate and to make employment decisions based upon evaluation. An institution which cannot defend its personnel decisions as legal and

non-discriminatory faces the bleak prospect of costly penalties and unwanted publicity.

As faculty become involved in peer review, they will assume many of the responsibilites and liabilities which formerly belonged only to the college districts. Peers will have to demonstrate the procedures they utilized in evaluating other faculty were fair and were an objective measure of the faculty member's job performance.

Employee Protection

Evaluation helps to protect the rights and interests of an employee by providing a set of procedures which must be followed prior to the making of employment decisions. As long as the procedures contain reasonable safeguards for individual rights of due process, the employee is assured of fair treatment. This must be applied to peer review as well. Evaluations of faculty by faculty should be subject to the same due process standards as administrative evaluations. Among these standards are:

- Prompt notice in the case of deficient performance with the provision for a reasonable period of time in which to improve.
- Availability of remedial programs.
- Access by the employee to all evaluative materials during the course of the evaluation.
- The opportunity to respond to the evaluation in writing.
- The right to purge negative evaluations after a specified length of time.
- The right to purge evaluations based on inaccurate, irrelevant, incomplete, or untimely information.
- If the evaluation results in adverse action by the employer, the right to appeal the action.
- The right to representation when an evaluation could result in an adverse action.
- Clear notice of the standards of performance before the evaluation process begins and subject to change only by mutual agreement.
- The right to be evaluated in accordance with the established standards of performance and the actual work assigned.

- The right to be evaluated in the same fashion as other employees who perform the same kind of work.

Questions about Peer Review

Formative v. Summative Peer Review

The first decision to be made by faculty bargaining peer review is whether the process should be formative or summative. Formative evaluation can be easily dealt with. Summative evaluation procedures need the full guarantees of due process. A mixed system, where peer review would be summative for some and formative for others, is also possible. For instance, tenured faculty could be evaluated formatively while tenure decisions for probationary faculty would be based upon summative peer review.

Who Evaluates?

In a pure system of peer review, evaluation would be performed by one or more colleagues of the faculty member to be evaluated. Such pure systems are unusual outside universities. A more common system is one that utilizes a committee composed of faculty members and administrators. It should be remembered that the more control the administration has over the process, the less pure it is as a system of peer review. In some cases, the administrator is the real evaluator with the peers only providing "input." This is the least desirable peer review system, because, while it gives the appearance of being peer centered, in fact the process belongs to the administrator who is writing the evaluation. In this type of system, peers lose control over how their judgements are utilized by the administrator.

Open or Closed?

There is a regrettable tendency among those who engage in peer review to try to have their judgements remain confidential. Unfortunately, as Prof. Thomas Shipka has pointed out, "silence and due process are deadly enemies . . ." Faculty should avoid at all costs, peer review systems where the evaluative judgements that form the basis for employment decisions are kept secret. The peer review process should be open to the view of the person being evaluated.

Three Models of Peer Review

Note: The following contract language sections are provided only as examples and are not meant for use as bargaining proposals.

Single evaluator peer review

Product: A written evaluation that is usually formative in nature. Written evaluation not necessarily shared with management.

Process: Faculty member is evaluated by another faculty member. The peer evaluator may be chosen by the dean, the department chair, by the evaluatee or a combination thereof. The evaluation most often is not used for summative purposes. If it is used for summative purposes, it is most often utilized as part of a more in-depth administrative evaluation. Once the evaluation is completed, it is shared with the person being evaluated and may or may not become part of the personnel file. We strongly recommend against this type of system for formative purposes because it is open to abuse.

Contract language example:

Peer Evaluation - Tenured Faculty

A. Selection of faculty evaluators

1. *Faculty evaluators will be selected by the person to be evaluated.*
2. *An evaluator must be a tenured full-time member of the faculty.*
3. *An evaluator may elect to do no more than two evaluations per semester.*

B. Procedure for Faculty Peer Evaluation

1. *The person being evaluated will choose the class or classes to be evaluated.*
2. *Evaluation should include:*
   a. *pre-observation discussion*
   b. *classroom observation*
   c. *use of materials*
   d. *use of equipment*
   e. *review of stated course objectives*
   f. *review of student evaluation methods*
   g. *post-observation discussion*

3. *A form signed by both parties will be sent to the division chairman verifying that the evaluation has been completed.*
   a. *It will list the class or classes observed and the dates of observations.*
   b. *It will not contain the substance of the evaluation.*
   c. *Only the verification will become part of the faculty person's confidential evaluation file.*

Contract Plan System

Product: A written outcome assessment based on a "growth contract," prepared by the faculty member in consultation with an evaluation committee.

Process: The institution develops a statement on the roles and responsibilities of faculty members. Within its context, the faculty member, in consultation with a self-selected evaluation committee, prepares a written "contract" or plan which includes assessment of strengths and weaknesses; areas of contribution and how each will be evaluated; goals and objectives for growth and improvement, including means of evaluation; resources necessary to implement the plan; and who will serve as members of the evaluation committee. Contract language may specify that membership be made up from predetermined groups, i. e., department, division, out-of-department, etc. The faculty member meets on a regular basis with the evaluation committee to review progress. At the end of the contract period, the committee prepares a written assessment. The evaluation may be summative or formative. It may be given to the faculty member and/or the administration, depending upon purpose.

Contract language example:

A. *Selection of Peer Review Committee*
   1. *Not later than October 15 of the year in which a faculty member is to be evaluated, a peer review committee shall be established.*
   2. *The committee shall be composed of one person nominated by the faculty member, one person nominated by the department or division chair, and one person nominated by the supervising dean.*

B. *Establishment of evaluation contract*
   1. *Not later than November 1 of the year in which a faculty member is to be evaluated, the faculty member shall sub-*

mit to his peer review committee a proposed evaluation contract which shall contain:

a. *Goals and objectives for the school year.*
b. *A plan for achievement of the specified goals and objectives.*
c. *Procedures for evaluation, including criteria for measurement.*

2. *The peer review committee shall meet with the faculty member to be evaluated to finalize the evaluation contract by mutual agreement.*

C. *Evaluation procedure*

1. *During the course of the evaluation period, the faculty member to be evaluated shall meet with the peer review committee on a regular basis to review progress toward stated goals and objectives.*
2. *During the course of the evaluation, strict confidentiality shall be maintained provided that the faculty member being evaluated has complete and open access to all materials, including observations, and reports which are to be used as a basis for the evaluation.*
3. *If, during the course of the evaluation period, mitigating circumstances arise which necessitate a change in the evaluation procedure, the evaluation contract may be modified by mutual agreement.*
4. *At the conclusion of the evaluation period, and in no case later than February 1, the peer review committee shall complete a written evaluation based upon the faculty member's evaluation contract. In the case of probationary employees, the written evaluation shall contain a recommendation as to the tenure status of the faculty member pursuant to Education Code Section 87608 et. seq.*
5. *If the written evaluation notes deficiencies in a faculty member's performance, they shall be specific and shall be accompanied by recommendations for improvement.*
6. *In the case of a rating of unsatisfactory, the faculty member being evaluated shall meet with the peer review committee to develop a remediation plan. The faculty member shall be provided with assistance in completing the remediation plan.*

Secret committee peer review

Product: Two or more independently prepared written judgements about the faculty member, which are pooled and used by administrators in either whole or in part.

Process: Two or more faculty members are selected to serve as evaluators. They may be nominated by the person to be evaluated, chosen by the administrator doing the evaluation, or some combination thereof. These persons form an evaluation committee that never meets in order to protect the anonymity of the evaluators. The evaluating dean acts as the liaison between committee members, providing materials as required. Theoretically, each committee member arrives at an independent judgement about the person being evaluated and submits it to the dean who pools the information and makes a judgement based on the information provided. This system is the most open to abuse of all peer review models.

Contract language example:

A. Peer review

1. *The peer review committee shall be composed of the supervising dean, and two peer evaluators: One to be selected by the dean and one to be selected by the faculty member being evaluated.*
2. *Each peer evaluator shall make an assessment of the faculty member's performance.*
3. *The dean shall utilize the peer evaluations in formulating his evaluation of the faculty member.*

Bargaining Peer Review

The following points should be considered by faculty who are in the process of bargaining peer review provisions.

- Beware of boiler plate language - There will be a tremendous temptation to simply adopt language in use elsewhere or to utilize "boiler plate" language from some source. This can result in problems, however. The preferable course is to develop language suited to a given campus or college district by beginning with a conceptual framework and then working out the specific language around the desired framework. It is important to work with CTA staff during this period of development, in order to get professional expertise in the development of the language.
- See the contract as a whole - Good peer review language doesn't mean much if the rest of the contract does not support it. As a minimum, you should also try to achieve binding arbitration, to make the provision truly enforceable, and a non-discrimination clause. The non-discrimination clause can go a long way toward preventing discriminatory application of peer-review, something also mandated by the new education code sections.
- Get an early start - Begin the process early enough so that you can develop the peer review language in a thoughtful manner. If your contract already contains peer review, the language should be studied to see if it can be improved or updated. A minimum timeline of 120 days should be utilized from development to final agreement.